

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, February 9, 1915.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our heavenly Father, from whom proceedeth all things, without whom we are nothing, impart unto us light, strength, courage, that we may meet the duties and responsibilities of the new day, and receive at its close Thine approbation and the approval of our own consciences; in the name of Him who taught us life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; and all praise, glory, and honor shall be Thine forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

FEDERAL BUILDING, HONOLULU, HAWAII.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 5295) to amend existing legislation providing for the acquisition of a site and the construction of a building thereon for the accommodation of the post office, United States courts, customhouse, and other governmental offices at Honolulu, Territory of Hawaii, and for other purposes, and to agree to the conference asked by the Senate on said bill.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title of the bill. The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent to agree to the conference asked by the Senate. Is there objection?

There was no objection; and the Speaker announced as the conferees on the part of the House Mr. CLARK of Florida, Mr. BURNETT, and Mr. AUSTIN.

ALSTON G. DAYTON.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to call up House resolution 541, directing the Committee on the Judiciary to inquire and report whether the action of the House is necessary concerning the alleged official misconduct of Alston G. Dayton.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title of the resolution.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Speaker, by some oversight this resolution and the report upon it were not printed last night, and I ask unanimous consent to consider it nevertheless, and that the resolution be printed in the RECORD to-day.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to consider the resolution at the present time, and that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to-day. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

[House Report No. 1381 to accompany H. Res. 541.]

The Committee on the Judiciary, having had under consideration House resolution 541, relating to the alleged official misbehavior of Alston G. Dayton, United States district judge from the Northern District of West Virginia, report the same back with the recommendation that it be amended to read as follows; and as so amended, that it be adopted:

"Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary be directed to inquire and report whether the action of this House is necessary concerning the alleged official misbehavior of Alston G. Dayton, United States district judge for the Northern District of West Virginia; whether he, the said Alston G. Dayton, has unlawfully conspired with certain corporations and individuals to bring about the removal from office of the late John J. Jackson, judge of the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of West Virginia; whether he has shown marked favoritism to certain corporations having extensive litigation in his court; whether he has summoned on juries in his court persons connected with certain corporations to which he has shown marked favoritism during his term of office; whether he has abused his power and influence as judge to further the interests of his son, Arthur Dayton; whether he has violated the acts of Congress regulating the selection of jurors; whether he has lent his services as judge to the coal operators of West Virginia by improperly issuing injunctions; whether he has shown hatred and bitterness toward miners on trial in his court; whether he has used his office as judge to discourage and prevent said miners from exercising their lawful right to organize and peaceably assemble under the laws of the United States and the State of West Virginia; whether he has conspired with certain corporations and individuals in the formation of a carbon trust in violation of law; whether he has openly stated that he would not permit the United Mine Workers of America to exist within the jurisdiction of his court; whether he has stated in open court that the United Mine Workers of America are criminal conspirators; and whether he has been guilty of any misbehavior for which he should be impeached."

And in making this investigation the said committee is hereby authorized to send for persons and papers, administer oaths, take testimony, employ a clerk and a stenographer, if necessary, and is also authorized to appoint a subcommittee to act for and on behalf of the whole committee whenever and wherever it may be deemed advisable to take testimony for the use of said committee. The said subcommittee while so employed shall have the same powers in respect to obtaining testimony as are herein given to said Committee on the Judiciary, with a sergeant at arms, by himself or deputy, who shall

serve the process of said committee or subcommittee and shall attend the sittings of the same as ordered and directed thereby.

The Speaker shall have authority to sign and the Clerk to attest subpoenas for any witness or witnesses.

The expense of such investigation shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers approved by the chairman of the Judiciary Committee and approved by the Committee on Accounts and evidenced by the signature of the chairman thereof.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Speaker, on the 12th of last June the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] impeached Judge Dayton on 26 separate and distinct charges. The House referred the resolution and the charges to the Judiciary Committee, and those charges have been investigated carefully by a subcommittee for three or four months. The subcommittee reported, eliminating about 13 or 14 of the charges, but felt that there was enough testimony to authorize an investigation of the charges set forth in the resolution which has been read. We felt that it would be the best thing for the country, for the judge himself, for the House, and for the judiciary that this investigation be had. These charges have been published in the newspapers of the country, and the Judiciary Committee were almost of the unanimous opinion that for the good of all concerned they should be investigated, and that if true the judge should be impeached, but that if not true he should be acquitted and reinstated in the regard and confidence of the country. Therefore I move the passage of the resolution which I have just presented.

Mr. MOSS of West Virginia. Will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. WEBB. With pleasure.

Mr. MOSS of West Virginia. Did the committee in arriving at its conclusion consider any part of the evidence tendered on behalf of Judge Dayton?

Mr. WEBB. I do not think the committee did officially consider Judge Dayton's defense as presented to the committee in affidavits. I think each one of the subcommittee read Judge Dayton's affidavits, but I do not think they considered them in connection with making their report.

Mr. DANFORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEBB. I yield with pleasure to my colleague on the committee.

Mr. DANFORTH. I know the gentleman will not make a misstatement intentionally.

Mr. WEBB. Not for the world.

Mr. DANFORTH. But I think it is not a fact that each member of the subcommittee in charge of this matter did examine the affidavits. I think the assertions are quite to the contrary, and that they have not been considered.

Mr. WEBB. I may be in error as to one of the subcommittee. I am informed by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. IGOE] that he did make an examination of Judge Dayton's affidavits.

Mr. DANFORTH. The gentleman is in error as to two members of the subcommittee.

Mr. WEBB. Did not you yourself read them?

Mr. DANFORTH. No; I carefully abstained from examining them.

Mr. WEBB. Then, of course, I do not make the statement. The affidavits of Judge Dayton were in the committee room, and the subcommittee had access to them.

Mr. DANFORTH. In other words, the entire investigation has been ex parte on papers that were not testimony in any sense of the word—hearsay affidavits.

Mr. WEBB. That is true, Mr. Speaker. In the nature of the case we could not have any trial of it, because the subcommittee had no power to subpoena witnesses, and it was not their province to try the case. The duty of our committee was simply to make a preliminary investigation to ascertain whether we should recommend to the House a full and complete investigation.

Mr. DANFORTH. I am not objecting to the investigation, because I think it will be in the interest of justice and fairness.

Mr. WEBB. I understand; and I am glad to agree to what the gentleman says, for I think the same.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the pending resolution providing for an investigation as to charges of misconduct which have been made against Judge Alston G. Dayton, I desire to state with authority that neither Judge Dayton nor his friends have any desire to impede nor obstruct, even if it were possible, the passage of this resolution, nor the investigation which will be made under its authority. On the contrary, I am advised that Judge Dayton courts the fullest and most complete investigation that can be made of his personal conduct from every standpoint since he has been on the Federal bench. In common with other personal friends of Judge Dayton, and with no knowledge of the specifications under which testimony pro and con will be taken, other than their reading by the Clerk in the presence of the House a few moments ago, I desire to express the hope and belief that his answer to any charges

of misconduct of any nature or from any source will be complete and conclusive. I am fully convinced that the Committee on the Judiciary and its able chairman have approached this matter conscientiously and have acted, as the chairman has just stated, with due regard to the serious importance of the issue thus raised, the best interests of the public and of Judge Dayton himself, and the honor and integrity of the high position involved. I am further convinced that the Judiciary Committee of this House will discharge its duties under this resolution with absolute fairness and impartiality, according to accusers and accused the fullest opportunity of presenting the facts, and in the end that it will make a report to this House as to its findings that will be judicial in its fairness.

I therefore will vote for this resolution, and I ask all the friends of Judge Dayton upon this floor, many of whom have served with him here as a Member of Congress for 10 years and personally know the high character of his attainments, to do likewise.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. Is martial law still in force up in West Virginia?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Is it in force out in Ohio?

Mr. GORDON. No, sir; it is not.

The SPEAKER. This is out of order. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. WEBB, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

THE LINCOLN MEMORIAL.

The SPEAKER. The Chair announces again for the accommodation of Members that the Lincoln Memorial Commission desires that all Members shall write their names on the parchment which is to be deposited in the corner stone of the Lincoln Monument. As it is difficult to write on parchment, they want it written with a special ink and a special pen, which will be found in the Speaker's lobby. The Members from Kentucky are to sign seriatim.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 21318, the sundry civil appropriation bill. And pending that motion, before the general exodus occurs, I want to say to Members that I shall ask the House to remain in session for some time to-night.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. CRISP in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the sundry civil appropriation bill, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For wages of plate printers, at piece rates to be fixed by the Secretary of the Treasury, not to exceed the rates usually paid for such work, including the wages of printers' assistants when employed, \$1,561,421, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury: *Provided*, That no portion of this sum shall be expended for printing United States notes or Treasury notes of larger denominations than those that may be canceled or retired, except in so far as such printing may be necessary in executing the requirements of the act to define and fix the standard of value, to maintain the parity of all forms of money issued or coined by the United States, to refund the public debt, and for other purposes, approved March 14, 1900.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to ask the gentleman from New York if he gave any further consideration to the suggestion that I made to him about the paragraph at the bottom of page 33 in regard to printing Federal reserve currency?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The committee has used the language which is in common use in the department and which has been used here for a good many years. I have not had an opportunity to inquire along the line suggested by the gentleman from Illinois, but I will do so before the bill is completed.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman can see that on page 38 they refer to Federal reserve bank currency, and on page 33 to Federal reserve currency. There may be a distinction, although I can not imagine how there would be.

Mr. FITZGERALD. There is a distinction between Federal reserve currency and Federal reserve bank currency, but I wish to make the inquiry so that if any change is to be made we will be sure that there is no error made.

Mr. MANN. If there is a distinction, there is an error in the bill, because one provision authorizes the purchase of 13,500,000 sheets of paper, and the other provision is to print it. If there is a distinction, you buy the paper for one kind of currency and print it for another kind. That is all the paper you can buy for that purpose.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I am having an inquiry made so as to get the language that will be correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For engravers' and printers' materials and other materials except distinctive paper, miscellaneous expenses, including paper for internal-revenue stamps, and for purchase, maintenance, and driving of necessary horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles, when, in writing, ordered by the Secretary of the Treasury, \$615,526, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order to the paragraph.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I offer the following amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 35, line 10, after the word "necessary," insert the words "motor propelled."

Mr. MANN. I withdraw the point of order, Mr. Chairman. I would like to have the Clerk read the paragraph as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

For engravers' and printers' materials and other materials except distinctive paper, miscellaneous expenses, including paper for internal-revenue stamps, and for purchase, maintenance, and driving of necessary motor-propelled horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles, when, in writing, ordered by the Secretary of the Treasury, \$615,526, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. MANN. I wondered how they could have "motor-propelled horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles."

Mr. FITZGERALD. The amendment should be modified by adding the word "and" to it, so that you insert the words "motor-propelled and."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be modified.

The Clerk read the amendment as modified, as follows:

After the word "necessary," in line 10, page 35, insert the words "motor-propelled and."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I notice this paragraph increases the appropriation from \$470,000, as it is now in the current law, to \$615,526. Is that for the paper for the internal-revenue stamps or is it for automobiles and passenger-carrying vehicles?

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is for the paper for revenue stamps, which was transferred from the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to the Bureau of Engraving and Printing. The Bureau of Engraving and Printing has purchased all of the other paper, and it was thought advisable to allow them to purchase the paper for the internal-revenue stamps.

Mr. MANN. The increase is for paper for internal-revenue stamps made necessary by the war-revenue tax.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is for all internal-revenue stamps.

Mr. MANN. How much is to be used for automobiles?

Mr. FITZGERALD. They have an automobile wagonette—I think that is what they term it—two electrical vehicles of 1,000 pounds capacity, on which they carry the mail, samples, stamps, and for general passenger service; also an electrical dump wagon and two electric trucks. They have a wagonette, I understand, in which they transport the persons who witness the destruction of securities from the Bureau of Engraving and Printing to the Treasury Department.

Mr. MANN. I notice in this bill there are twenty-odd places where you provide for passenger-carrying vehicles of some kind, and usually put in a limitation, as I recall, of the amount that can be expended for that purpose. I think it is a proper limitation in view of the fact that it is stated that the Secretary of War has purchased an automobile for private use out of an appropriation for the transportation of the Army, an item carrying a good many million dollars. How can the gentleman tell how much of the \$615,000, which is an increase of \$145,000 over the existing appropriation, will be used for the purchase of automobiles for the Treasury Department?

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is not expected that any will be used for the purchase of automobiles. The motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles are somewhat different in connection with the bureau than with other services, because in addition to the members of the committee they carry the securities.

Mr. MANN. The committee last year inserted a provision in reference to automobiles and other passenger-carrying vehicles. What good does that do, when you make an appropriation of \$615,000, all of it available for the purchase of these vehicles? What is accomplished by the law which was

passed? I could not see what was going to be accomplished when it was passed, but what does it accomplish where there is no limitation except to insert the language? They will have the same authority hereafter as they have had heretofore.

Mr. FITZGERALD. In many of the items the word "purchase" has been eliminated. In others a limitation of the amount to be expended has been inserted.

Mr. MANN. That is what I was trying to get at. Why is there no limitation in this item?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Depending very largely upon the information obtained as to the character of the vehicles used and what was contemplated. Under this provision, with the information obtained from year to year, it is possible to keep track of and see whether any attempt is made to utilize moneys for purposes not contemplated or stated when the authorization is made.

Mr. MANN. There is a limitation in some of the items, but there is no limitation in this item.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That is true; there is not.

Mr. MANN. It would be very convenient for the Secretary of the Treasury, if he should desire an automobile, to say that he had the active consent of Congress and a provision authorizing him to purchase an automobile for his use out of an appropriation which specifically provided for it, with no limitation as to the amount.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, the committee has tried to adapt language to the peculiar situation developed by this paragraph. Of course, it is possible for the departments to abuse authority which is reposed in them under the law. The committee has felt that there was no likelihood that the Secretary of the Treasury would attempt to get an automobile for personal use out of an appropriation of this character, where it is clearly intended for the service of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing. There are some things that more or less influence members of the committee in these matters, and perhaps one thing is the fact that the Secretary of the Treasury already has an automobile of his own, and there is little likelihood of his being tempted to get one at Government expense.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, certainly all members of the Cabinet are conscientious, and certainly the Secretary of War is quite as conscientious as any of the others, if not more so, and yet it is said that he purchased an automobile out of an appropriation for transportation of the Army. There is no connection in fact between transporting the Secretary of War and his family around the city of Washington with the transportation of the Army. I am not criticizing the action of the Secretary of War, but I think there is no further reach between purchasing an automobile for the Secretary of the Treasury out of an appropriation for the Bureau of Engraving and Printing than there is in purchasing an automobile for the Secretary of War out of an appropriation for the transportation of the Army.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, my recollection is that in the report furnished to Congress pursuant to a resolution asking for the number of automobiles in the various departments, and the appropriations for purchasing the same, it was stated that the automobile purchased out of the appropriation for the transportation of the Army had been obtained for the purpose of transporting the Secretary of War, the Chief of Staff, and other officers of the Army. Whether the Chief of Staff and other officers ever have an opportunity to use the automobile is something that I can not answer. I do not hesitate to say that I believe that the purchase of an automobile for the use of the Secretary of War out of an appropriation for the transportation of the Army can not be justified. Congress never had any such intention, and it took a very extraordinary construction of the appropriation to justify it.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, it is something like the purchase of an oil painting, of which there is, I believe, one instance in the State Department, where they had painted the portrait of the Secretary of State and charged up a part of the price of it to the appropriation for paint and the rest, I believe, to the appropriation for carpenter work.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That was under another administration.

Mr. MANN. I understand. I do not think there is any distinction between Republican and Democratic administrations in these respects.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I am not certain whether that portion of the expenditure was charged up to paint or to whitewash.

Mr. MANN. I believe it was charged to oils and paints, and the frame to some other appropriation like carpenter work, or something of that kind. They occasionally do those things where they have a chance.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes; they all look alike at the Treasury Department, regardless of the politics of the administration.

Mr. MANN. Oh, yes; these things are not chargeable to one administration as against another. It will always be done unless Congress protects from it by legislation.

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. The gentleman from Illinois is usually very accurate in his statements, and I think the majority of the Members accept them as facts when made on the floor of the House. I should like to ask him his authority for the statement that the Secretary of War has purchased for his own private use an automobile out of the appropriations made for the transportation of the Army?

Mr. MANN. That is not denied, I believe?

Mr. GOULDEN. I never heard it stated before, and it seems so doubtful that I am inclined to ask the gentleman for his authority.

Mr. MANN. It was stated on the floor of the House the other day publicly by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILBERT], and while I do not say that is the fact, it is my understanding it is not disputed. I would not say that it is merely for his private use. You can call it official use if you desire. It is used by himself and his family, and I think properly so. I do not object to giving any of the Cabinet officers an automobile, so far as I am concerned, for social uses. They have certain social obligations, but I think it were better for Congress to know when it makes an appropriation whether it is to be used for the purchase of an automobile or not. I would give each one of the Cabinet officers an automobile and maintain it, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. GOULDEN. But the gentleman would have it appear in the bill specifically appropriated for that purpose?

Mr. MANN. I would say so, and not have one of the Cabinet officers charge it up to some appropriation which was never intended to be used for that purpose.

Mr. GOULDEN. Is it not a fact that each Cabinet officer now has or is entitled to an automobile?

Mr. MANN. No; it is not the fact. I think the only Cabinet officers who have automobiles at the expense of the Government are the Secretary of War and the Secretary of Labor.

Mr. GOULDEN. My question was intended to apply to official business.

Mr. MANN. Those are two-horse carriages; they do not have expensive carriages.

Mr. GOULDEN. I know I have seen the Postmaster General riding in a carriage that looked as if it had been imported from his native State of Texas—driver and all.

Mr. MANN. The Postmaster General rides behind a very nice \$1,500-team of horses.

Mr. GOULDEN. I have never seen them.

Mr. MANN. Then the gentleman has not seen him drive it lately.

Mr. GOULDEN. This was six months or a year ago. I imagine that the gentleman is too busy to indulge much in this pleasure.

Mr. MANN. He has a fine span of horses costing \$1,500, and he is worthy of it.

Mr. GOULDEN. Surely, and I congratulate him on having them.

Mr. MANN. They are expensive for hard times.

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Chairman, I heartily indorse the statement made by the gentlemen from Illinois with regard to the high character of the Secretary of War and when this statement was made that he had secured an automobile, charged to the Army appropriation, for private or personal uses, I did not credit it, and hence I asked the question of the gentleman from Illinois to know just what his authority was for the statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is considered as withdrawn.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the following amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 35, line 13, after the word "Treasury," insert:

"Provided, That no part of the appropriation herein made shall be expended for motor-propelled or horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles intended for other than official use."

Mr. FITZGERALD. If the gentleman will allow. There is a general statute to that effect.

Mr. MOORE. I do not know whether the gentleman will accept that amendment. But to me the colloquy which took place between the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Illinois was most interesting. The gentleman from New York

explained his own amendment to include motor-propelled vehicles, but established no dividing line between the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase automobiles for official or for personal use. It seems to be an open question still whether the Secretary of the Treasury, under this lump-sum appropriation, would have the right to buy 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, or 10 motor-propelled vehicles if he so desired. Apparently there is no limitation upon him in this respect. I agree thoroughly with the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOULDEN] that the Secretary of the Treasury or any Cabinet officer ought to be provided with a motor-propelled vehicle for his own use. Officials of a great Government like the United States, such as Cabinet officers, ought not to be compelled to make their official or social calls in Washington on trolley cars. These officials have a status that ought to be recognized. It seems to me that one of the most ridiculous things the Democratic Party ever undertook to do in this House was to deny the Speaker of the House an automobile. Why should these great officers of the Government, upon whom we place great responsibility and of whom we expect the best service they can give, be compelled to go about their business, socially or officially, hampered by delays at street corners or made to hang onto car straps? If they are to have automobiles we ought to make specific appropriation therefor.

The committee itself ought to have the courage to say openly and directly that the Secretary or the Speaker should have an automobile, and the phraseology of this bill ought not to be so hedged about as to leave it to the Cabinet officer to buy a machine if he needs one or to buy more than one.

Mr. GOULDEN. The gentleman is in favor of specifically providing for an appropriation for the purchase of an automobile for each Cabinet officer as well as the Speaker of the House for any and all purposes.

Mr. MOORE. I believe there ought to be no subterfuge about it.

Mr. GOULDEN. I indorse the gentleman's statement heartily.

Mr. MOORE. We ought not to make an appropriation in this way and leave a wide discretion to the Cabinet officer. He ought to know exactly what his duties are and what his perquisites are, if you care to put it in that form.

Mr. GOULDEN. Again I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. MOORE. So that he would know what Congress intends a Cabinet officer should have.

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. I will.

Mr. SLOAN. The gentleman spoke about a Cabinet officer and others being given automobiles for their use in getting about. What reason or claim has a Cabinet officer for a private automobile furnished by the Government beyond that of any Congressman or any Senator who is compelled to dance attendance at the departments, whereas the heads of the departments never visit the Congressmen themselves.

Mr. MOORE. Well, there are only 9 Cabinet officers and there are 435 Members of Congress, and I think the situation is entirely different. These Cabinet officers have tremendous responsibilities. We impose executive and administrative responsibility upon them. I grant you that a Member of Congress has rights, and that those rights ought to be respected even in a Cabinet officer's office. I do not approve the practice which seems to prevail in some offices where a member of another body walks in over the head of a Member of the House.

Mr. SLOAN. I would like to ask the gentleman this question: Under our Constitution as established, has any Cabinet officer any greater responsibilities or duties than any Member of this House or the other body?

Mr. MOORE. Well, I think he has. I think a Cabinet officer of the United States has a tremendous responsibility. We impose it upon him.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOORE. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two or three minutes to answer the gentleman's question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SLOAN. A Cabinet officer is a creature of Congress, is he not?

Mr. MOORE. Not necessarily; a Cabinet officer is appointed by the President, and the President has a distinct function from that of Congress. Sometimes he does not recognize the function of Congress.

Mr. SLOAN. I mean were not these positions created by the lawmaking body of this country?

Mr. MOORE. The Constitution of the United States creates the President, and the President has the power to appoint.

Mr. SLOAN. But the positions themselves are created by law, are they not?

Mr. MOORE. The departments are created by Congress, of course, and we provide for the payment of their salaries. But I want to say to the gentleman that, while I do not agree with the Secretary of the Treasury in many of his policies, yet the Secretary of the Treasury is an officer of the Government, upon whom the greatest possible responsibility rests. He is responsible for the collection of the revenues and for their distribution, and that is a tremendous job.

Mr. LEVY. Do you not think it would be a great aid to the legislative business of this House if \$2,500 was expended for an electric car to connect the House Office Building with the House?

Mr. MOORE. That is not a bad idea. I would be liberal in helping the gentlemen of the House back and forth from the Office Building if it tires the gentlemen—

Mr. LEVY. It is not a question of tiring Members.

Mr. MOORE. If it tires any gentleman to walk back and forth, I think he ought to have assistance.

Mr. LEVY. It is not a question of tiring any Member. It is a question of expediting legislation and the answering of roll calls.

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman is right. It would expedite legislation. But in the case of a member of the Cabinet, considering that the people of the country like to meet him and expect him once in a while to come to them and explain his attitude upon public questions, or considering that committees and others have a right to discuss in a public way the affairs of the Nation as they are affected by the department over which the Secretary has control, I think this expenditure for an automobile is entirely proper; but there should be a specific appropriation.

Mr. DIES. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MOORE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DIES. How does my friend from Pennsylvania think it would do to establish a jitney service between the Capitol and the departments and the White House, so that we might have cooperative rides; that is to say, so that Members of the House and Senators could have a jitney service going to the White House and the departments, and the officers of the departments could come up here on business?

Mr. MOORE. Does the gentleman mean to have separate compartments for members of the Cabinet and separate compartments for Members?

Mr. DIES. Oh, no.

Mr. MOORE. I do not think that would be necessary at all. That would be a sort of white jim-crow proposition, and I do not think the country would stand for it.

Mr. DIES. Not necessarily jim-crow, but limited to Members of Congress and heads of departments, and let the Government issue the car tickets to Members of Congress and Cabinet officials, so that they could drop their tickets in the box. The gentleman knows what that service is.

Mr. MOORE. I understand what it is. It is the new nickel service which is proposed for Washington. The gentleman's idea is to have a service by which the members of the Cabinet would pay no more than Members of Congress, and all would get a cheap service. It might be a very excellent thing, but I would ask the gentleman from Texas, with all his fine democratic notions and his antisocialistic ideas, with some of which I am inclined to sympathize, whether he thinks it would be a pleasant thing for his patron saint—Thomas Jefferson—if he were on earth to-day, to have him stand out there in the rain on the corner of the Avenue, and wait for a car to come along, so crowded with people that the steam would pour out of the doors? Would it not be disturbing and discreditable to have the illustrious Jefferson step into that car, the cynosure of all eyes, subject to all kinds of criticism, and hang onto a strap until he got down to the White House. Would the gentleman like to see that?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will not be adopted. It is wholly unnecessary. Under the law every member of the Cabinet is entitled to horses and vehicles for his personal use. Each one of them has at least four vehicles and four horses or more. Now, it developed last year that automobiles were being obtained by different public officials without specific authority of Congress. An investigation was started, and a provision was incorporated in the legislative bill, under which the departments and all other branches of the public service are required to submit such detailed information to Congress as would enable it to keep track of just what is being done. Section 5 of the legislative act for the current year is as follows:

SEC. 5. No appropriation made in this or any other act shall be available for the purchase of any motor-propelled or horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicle for the service of any of the executive departments or

other Government establishments, or any branch of the Government service, unless specific authority is given therefor, and after the close of the fiscal year 1915 there shall not be expended out of any appropriation made by Congress any sum for purchase, maintenance, repair, or operation of motor-propelled or horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles for any branch of the public service of the United States unless the same is specifically authorized by law, and in the estimates for the fiscal year 1916 and subsequent fiscal years there shall be submitted in detail estimates for such necessary appropriations as are intended to be used for purchase, maintenance, repair, or operation of all motor-propelled or horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles, specifying the sums required, the public purposes for which said vehicles are intended, and the officials or employees by whom the same are to be used.

It so happens that the Bureau of Engraving and Printing has not made a statement showing how much is actually required for passenger-carrying vehicles. That is due somewhat to the fact that the motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, of which there are two, are used not only to carry persons, but to carry certain materials. They are not used in the way in which some of these other vehicles may be used. They are not joy vehicles.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. In a moment. Understanding thoroughly the purpose of this paragraph and having had it gone into very thoroughly, the committee submitted the bill this year without any limitation upon the amount to be expended, but the law now prohibits the expenditure of any funds for these vehicles unless for official purposes, and it is wholly useless to put such a provision on any particular appropriation bill when the law prohibits the expenditure of any appropriation for that purpose.

Mr. COX. I think the gentleman is correct in his interpretation of the law, but as I understood the reading of the law it requires these various departments to make an estimate as to the amount of money they propose to expend for motor-propelled vehicles.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Passenger-carrying.

Mr. COX. Motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes. For instance, it is not necessary to specify for motor-propelled trucks to be used in the service.

Mr. COX. Does the proposition before the House in this paragraph authorize the expenditure of any money for motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. COX. Why did not the department make an estimate for it?

Mr. FITZGERALD. This is a case where they did not, and it was due perhaps to the fact that the vehicle is not used exclusively for a passenger-carrying vehicle. They have two electric vehicles of a 1,000 pounds capacity to carry mail, samples, stamps, and general messenger service. One of these wagons is what they call an electric wagonette and is used to carry the committee to witness the destruction of the securities from the Bureau of Engraving and Printing to the Treasury, and with them they take the securities to be destroyed. So that it is not, strictly speaking, a passenger-carrying vehicle in the sense that Congress has in mind in speaking of those vehicles.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, I do not think I am excessively democratic. I will say further that I am not in favor of giving Members of Congress or Senators of the United States an automobile at the public expense, and I do not see any reason in the world why a member of the Cabinet should be provided with an automobile at the public expense. If we are not paying him enough salary, for one I think I have sufficient courage to vote the increase of salary.

But I think it is unwise to extend that sort of practice. I would not want a member of the Cabinet to stand out in the rain, as suggested by my friend from Pennsylvania; it is bad for anybody to stand out in the rain. However, I have observed one thing, that members of the Cabinet seldom come to the Capitol, and that Members of Congress of both branches are constantly in attendance on members of the Cabinet. If there was really any necessity from a public-service standpoint for public automobiles, they ought to make more frequent trips from here to the departments than from the departments to the Capitol.

Now, I want to say in that connection that the expenditures of our Government under this administration and under past administrations are shameful. No Government in this universe pretending to be a popular Government, a democratic republican Government, can long endure under the class of appropriations that Congress is annually enacting into law; and I would like to see some little democratic spirit in the country. I would like to see Cabinet and other officers of the Government understand that the service to the people is not only lip service but an actual service, and set a wholesome example of encouragement

to the people in this country. If there is an example that ought to be set to the American people, beginning with the humblest home up to the most palatial mansion, it is of economy and frugality and simplicity, to the end that we may maintain this democratic Republic.

I think, for one—and I will never think differently, I imagine—that Cabinet officers who buy expensive automobiles under a law that limits their use to public service and then use them for every service except the public service are setting a bad example to the people of this Republic. Of course, you can not defeat any such proposition; no more can you defeat a pension bill; no more can you defeat a public building or a rivers and harbors bill; but I do say this, and it is true, that a Member of Congress needs only to scrutinize appropriation bills to agree with me that we are making a shameful use of the public funds. [Applause.]

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I think the sort of amendment suggested by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, under which Cabinet officers might purchase and keep automobiles, is altogether unnecessary. They are already abundantly provided for in that respect.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield? I would like to have the amendment again read, for I think the gentleman misunderstands it. I propose to limit the use of the automobile to business purposes.

Mr. MONDELL. I should not agree to that. I have no quarrel with the possession by Cabinet officers of carriages or automobiles both for business and social purposes. I believe the dignity of the position rather requires it; I think it is even in keeping with Democratic simplicity. Speaking of Democratic simplicity, it is an interesting fact that under this Democratic administration Cabinet officers have more and better and more expensive vehicles than ever in the history of the Republic. But I do not quarrel with that. The objectionable feature of the matter is the lack of frankness, to use no harsher term, in the dealings between Congress and the Cabinet ministers and in the action of the Cabinet ministers in the purchase and acquiring of these vehicles. Some of them have been acquired under appropriations the language of which would not justify such a purpose. If Cabinet ministers, with their large responsibility, will only remain here in Washington and attend to their duties I think they are entitled to automobiles or carriages which present a goodly appearance.

I can not say so much when the Cabinet officials, in addition to securing all these equipages, fail to perform their important duties. Some suggestion has been made as to the comparative responsibilities of Cabinet ministers and Members of Congress. The Cabinet minister's responsibility is wider but no greater than that of a Member of Congress, and most Members of Congress believe that in order to serve the people it is their duty to be here on the job practically all the time. Some Cabinet ministers with large salaries and fine turnouts do not take that view of their duties and responsibilities, I regret to say. Rumor has it that at one crucial moment in our history, when the whole course and trend of our attitude toward a neighboring Republic might have been changed, and for the better, the action which would have been wise was not taken largely because the minister responsible for advising our attitude was fifteen hundred miles away fulfilling a lucrative lecture engagement.

Mr. BATHRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. BATHRICK. Mr. Chairman, I have heard a great deal of criticism, I believe unwarranted and unkind, respecting those matters, and as yet I have never heard any gentleman rise on this floor and make a specific statement as respects any harm that comes to this Government from the causes the gentleman has just referred to.

Mr. MONDELL. I am making it now.

Mr. BATHRICK. I do not think the gentleman is specific at all.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I think I am justified in criticising a man who is not attending to his public duties. I have been a Member of this House for 18 years, and I have been here every day that Congress has been in session save two. I do not know that I am entitled to any considerable amount of credit for that—that is my notion of my duty. If in addition to my duties and responsibilities, comparatively limited, I had the duties and responsibilities of a Secretary of State in time of war, I would think I was subject to the severest criticism if I left the Capital of the Nation for a single day, particularly for the purpose of increasing my income delivering paid lectures.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I have mentioned a specific instance, the psychological moment, when the whole trend of our attitude toward Mexico would probably have been modified except for the fact that the Secretary of State was away yonder beyond the Mississippi delivering lectures for pay, accompanied by yodlers, we are told, and other entertainers.

Mr. BATHRICK. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I can not yield.

Mr. BATHRICK. The gentleman speaks in uncertain terms.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming declines to yield.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I speak in no uncertain terms; but to come down a little later and to be quite specific, and satisfy even my genial friend from Ohio [Mr. BATHRICK], just a few days ago, within a week, with this great European war going on, with numberless important questions constantly arising with regard to our shipping and our interests near and about the seat of war, the Secretary of State has notoriously been traveling abroad throughout the land delivering political speeches and lectures for pay. He was beyond the Mississippi at the time when the recent declaration relative to the status of large areas of the sea used by our shipping was made by Germany, which may profoundly affect our relations with that great Empire. He has been away notoriously time and again, day after day, and week after week, with war raging all over Europe, with turbulent and troublesome conditions on our southern border, with foreign complications rising thick and fast all around us, including our delectable affair with Santo Domingo, just now being investigated, this official, charged under the law, as the adviser of the President, with responsibility in these vital matters, believes that he is justified in spending a large portion—

Mr. BATHRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman state what harm has come from it?

Mr. MONDELL. He believes he is justified in spending a large portion of his time delivering lectures for pay and haranguing the people throughout the Nation in the interest of the administration, whose affairs and responsibilities he is neglecting.

Mr. BARTLETT and Mr. BATHRICK rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, having heretofore yielded to the gentleman from Ohio, I now yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, is it not a fact that whenever the distinguished Secretary of State is absent a very able and distinguished and efficient Assistant Secretary of State from the gentleman's own State is there to take his place and represent the Government?

Mr. MONDELL. I think that is very fortunate.

Mr. BARTLETT. I do, too. [Laughter.]

Mr. MONDELL. I will say no more, however, upon that point.

Mr. Chairman, it is all right, in my opinion, to furnish these high officials with the proper vehicles. There is a certain dignity that goes with an office to be maintained, even from the viewpoint of democratic simplicity. I am not complaining because under a Democratic administration there are more and larger and finer automobiles in the possession of certain high officials than any time heretofore, but I am complaining—at least, I am voicing my opinion relative to that view of an official's duty which, in times when the Nation's interests are liable at any moment to be profoundly disturbed by occurrences abroad, seems to justify the man most charged with responsibility in our foreign relations in wandering hither and yon throughout the land, from coast to coast, from the Lakes to the Gulf, delivering Chautauqua lectures and endeavoring to make the people believe that the country is prosperous and doing well under this administration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has again expired.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the pending amendment.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to state that when the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] offered his amendment there was an amendment pending offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] that has not yet been voted upon. The Chair, therefore, will put the question first

on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York, the committee amendment, which, without objection, will be again reported.

There was no objection, and the Clerk again reported the amendment offered by Mr. FITZGERALD.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

There was no objection, and the Clerk again reported the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I have really a very warm, personal regard as well as the highest official respect for the Secretary of Labor, who formerly served in this House, receiving a salary of \$7,500 a year and no passenger-carrying vehicle at public expense. He was made Secretary of Labor in March, 1913, receiving a salary of \$12,000 a year.

On November 5, 1913, there was paid out of the contingent fund of the Department of Labor a sum for the purchase of a brougham, one cabriolet, one opera bus, I suppose for official purposes. That was in November. In January there was purchased for the Secretary of Labor, in addition to the three vehicles already enumerated, one touring car. In February they paid a garage company here \$38.29 for oil. In March the same garage company, care and maintenance of Secretary's equipment, \$75.62, and in the same month they paid livery for horse hire and board \$57, and to another man for repairs to Secretary's automobile, \$20.50. In April the first items for repairs only amounted to \$3, but they paid to the garage in May, for care and maintenance, \$270.93; in June \$58.34 for the same purpose, and in August they paid for the month of July, for maintenance of the Secretary's automobile, \$93.73. Those are all out of the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914. Now, I do not complain of these purchases. I agree with what the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] said. I think that a Cabinet officer is entitled to have an automobile, entitled to have other conveyances. I think that a Cabinet officer's duties require that he should have proper conveyances. The men who come here as Cabinet officers and who have a family have certain social obligations which it is impossible to avoid and maintain a proper dignity for the country. I do not complain of these purchases, though I think it would have been wiser, probably, if Congress specifically provided for the purchase and maintenance of vehicles for the members of the Cabinet. Just how it is usually done I do not undertake to say. In this case Secretary Wilson has frankly included all of these items in a report which he has made of the contingent fund. I expect in some of the departments, and this is not confined to this administration by any means, it might be very difficult to find just how the money has been provided for the maintenance and purchase of vehicles in the past.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 35, in line 11, after the word "carrying," strike out the word "vehicle" and insert the word "trucks."

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, from what we can gather from this discussion it appears that what the Treasury Department wants in this instance is business motor carrying trucks or horse-drawn vehicles. It does not appear to want automobiles for social purposes. Why not state in this bill exactly what it is intended the money shall be expended for. The difficulty is that when we appropriate for engravers' and printers' materials and other materials and for motor-propelled and horse-drawn vehicles, the money to be expended on the order of the Secretary of the Treasury in writing, amounting to \$615,526, we do not tell the Secretary to confine his expenditure with respect to motor-drawn vehicles to business purposes, but we do give the Secretary of the Treasury latitude to buy with that \$615,000, if the order is in writing, an automobile for social purposes, a cabriolet, an opera car, or any of the other of those cars to which the gentleman from Illinois has just made reference. Now, if we mean that the Secretary of the Treasury shall buy a car for business or for social purposes, why not say so? The committee has the power to do this, but it prefers rather not to take the responsibility.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. Yes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. The gentleman seeks to offer an amendment; will it not be necessary to strike out the last word in line 10, the word "passenger," otherwise the language of the bill would be "and necessary horse-drawn passenger trucks."

Mr. MOORE. No; it would not necessarily, because in carrying material these men ride on trucks. They are cars in the nature of trucks and carry officials of the department on their business.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. What are called passenger-carrying trucks?

Mr. MOORE. I presume so. Now, one gentleman who used to advocate "the rights of the people" on the floor, and who always appealed for the downtrodden, became chairman of a great committee. When you asked him why he was not quite so enthusiastic as theretofore he would say, "Oh, things are different now, we have got the responsibility." Political changes like these induce men to go to dinners and put on dress suits. Sometimes they go to the theaters and ride in automobiles. It is not extraordinary. But even this does not justify the great Committee on Appropriations failing to indicate what its purpose is in introducing a lump-sum appropriation like this.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I am reluctant to believe that any other Member of the House is as confused as the gentleman from Pennsylvania as to the facts about this matter. This paragraph is—

For engravers' and printers' materials and other materials except distinctive paper, miscellaneous expenses, including paper for internal-revenue stamps, and for purchase, maintenance, and driving of necessary horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles, when, in writing, ordered by the Secretary of the Treasury, \$615,526, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Since I have been chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, investigations conducted by that committee have disclosed what we believed to be abuses in connection with the acquisition of automobiles for passenger-carrying purposes. As a result section 5 of the legislative act for the current fiscal year, which I have heretofore read to-day, was enacted.

The Bureau of Engraving and Printing has not only motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, but it has horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles, and it is out of this appropriation that both classes are maintained. No money could be expended out of this or any other appropriation for that purpose unless authority was specifically given in the item. The gentleman from Pennsylvania, however, instead of conferring authority to maintain and operate the existing vehicles, proposes that the word "vehicle" be stricken out and the word "truck" inserted, and that authority be given for the maintenance and operation of passenger-carrying trucks. It may be that in the city of Philadelphia there are vehicles properly characterized as passenger-carrying trucks.

Mr. GORDON. It is a slow town.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Having a slight acquaintance with some few residents of the city of Philadelphia I am inclined to believe that that is the only type of vehicle in which they ought properly to be transported [laughter], but we are attempting to provide for the conduct of the service of the Government. I have a list of the horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles and motor-propelled vehicles used for both purposes in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing. I wish the law to be so framed as to enable that great establishment to be conducted legitimately and without embarrassment. The gentleman from Pennsylvania insists that trucks shall be used when any of the employees of that establishment are sent to their homes, as they frequently are, as the result of illness. I wish to have them taken in an ordinary vehicle used by ordinary human beings in civilized countries. The gentleman from Pennsylvania insists that they must be carried in a truck.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. Are we to understand from the gentleman's criticism that he desires the department to buy automobiles under this paragraph?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, that is so far from what is contemplated that there is no use to discuss it.

Mr. MOORE. It is the point at issue. Does the gentleman wish to have the department buy passenger-carrying automobiles under this paragraph?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman from Pennsylvania works himself up into a great state of excitement—

Mr. MOORE. Not at all. The gentleman does not answer my question.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Over the probability of the Secretary of the Treasury buying a passenger-carrying automobile for his own use.

Mr. MOORE. Not at all. I want him to have one. The gentleman side-steps again.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Let me finish this statement, because the gentleman is too excited even to describe his own condition. The gentleman is wrought up over the probability of the Secretary of the Treasury buying a passenger-carrying vehicle for himself out of the appropriation which is made for the miscellaneous expenses of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, and in which paragraph authority is given to maintain and operate and purchase certain passenger-carrying vehicles required in the proper conduct of that establishment. I hope the amendment will not be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MOORE. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have one minute more, that he may answer the question I put to him a moment ago. Regardless of the stale old Philadelphia joke, I desire to know whether the gentleman from New York desires in this appropriation of \$615,000 to give the Secretary of the Treasury the discretion to buy passenger-carrying automobiles for social as well as other purposes?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not, because the law specifically prohibits any such purchase, and several times since this discussion began I have stated that there is a law to that effect.

Mr. MOORE. Apparently it is ineffective, for the gentleman from Illinois has just indicated that at least three passenger-carrying cars for social purposes have been purchased in the Department of Labor under a similar lump-sum appropriation.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman is mistaken, because I stated the law under which horse-drawn vehicles are purchased by the heads of executive departments for their personal use. That was a law enacted during a Republican Congress and during the service of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Chairman, with the permission of the chairman of the committee I ask unanimous consent to return to the paragraph relating to the St. Louis subtreasury.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I call up the motion to strike out the appropriation for the subtreasury at St. Louis, which was passed yesterday in the absence of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLDT].

The CHAIRMAN. Yesterday the Committee of the Whole passed over the provision for the subtreasury at St. Louis. There is a motion pending to strike out that provision.

Mr. IGOE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. IGOE. In the Record of yesterday I find that the motion of the gentleman from Illinois to strike out is printed following the preceding paragraph relating to the St. Louis post office.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the pending amendment is to strike out the provision for the Subtreasury in St. Louis.

Mr. MANN. In lines 14 and 15.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Chairman, this appropriation is intended for a new subtreasury building at the city of St. Louis. When the matter came up before the committee it was stated that probably the policy of the Government with respect to the subtreasuries would be changed and these subtreasuries abolished. My answer to that was that if the subtreasuries are ever abolished, there are enough Government offices in St. Louis, for which we are now paying rent, which could be accommodated in this new building. That argument holds good to-day. We are paying in the city of St. Louis between \$54,000 and \$56,000 for rentals for all kinds of Government offices. In fact, since the Federal Reserve Board has acquired quarters, I believe the amount has been increased to about \$75,000, so that there can be no question about the absolute necessity of providing accommodations for the housing of the Government service in the city of St. Louis.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Yes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Is this to be a one-story building?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. No; the intention was to have offices on the top of the Subtreasury.

Mr. FITZGERALD. How many stories?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. About three stories.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Does not the gentleman know; the plans are prepared, are they not?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I do not think so. I think the \$50,000 which we are about to appropriate are partly for the purpose of preparing plans.

Mr. FITZGERALD. What particular services of the Government will be accommodated?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. If you will make what is called an office building, we can accommodate all of the Government offices.

Mr. FITZGERALD. What branches of the service was it intended should be housed there?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. All of the branches outside of the Subtreasury that are renting quarters, as far as possible.

Mr. FITZGERALD. But what are they?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I was about to tell the gentleman. We have the meat-inspection office, Lighthouse Service, Mississippi River Commission, the Quartermaster Department of the Army, the Immigration Service, and there are quite a number of other branches of the service which are now housed in offices rented by the Government, and which, as I say, pay an aggregate rent of about \$75,000.

Mr. FITZGERALD. This was to be a building for the Subtreasury, and designed with vaults and arranged for banking purposes.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Yes; but it could be made into an office building with slight changes. Of course I know that to do it would involve a change of existing law.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is a great change to convert a subtreasury building into an office building and have it worth anything for that purpose.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. If you will leave out the word "subtreasury" and say a building for Federal offices—

Mr. FITZGERALD. Is there a subtreasury in St. Louis?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Yes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. This was to be a palatial building, costing a million dollars, exclusive of the site.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. It was designed to accommodate other branches of the service.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Those were only put in to give it momentum.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. The initiation of the building for the subtreasury in St. Louis has quite a history. The gentleman will remember that some years ago there was a defalcation in the office of the St. Louis subtreasury, and it was stated at the time that it was impossible for the inspectors to supervise the work there in a proper way, because the subtreasury is located in the present Federal building on the second floor, where it is impossible to have proper Government supervision. For that reason it was suggested that in all cities where a subtreasury might be erected there should be a subtreasury building especially adapted for the purpose. In conformity with that idea the committee at that time authorized the erection of the building, and with the idea also of accommodating a number of other branches of the service.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I ask that my time be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Chairman, I want to suggest to the House that, in the first place, it is very doubtful whether the subtreasuries will be abolished. And if they should not be abolished, we could perhaps house our subtreasury on the ground floor of the old post-office building which has now been vacated because the post office has been moved to a new building.

Mr. FITZGERALD. This building, if constructed, must be constructed in the manner that will make it suitable for a subtreasury, and if made suitable for a subtreasury there will be an expenditure of a considerable sum that will be apparently wasted if it is not to be used for that purpose. For instance, one large item of expense is the vaults for holding coin, bullion, and currency. I think from an investigation that has been made it is very doubtful whether the independent treasury system will be continued. The Federal reserve bank will absorb all of its functions. It seems to me that in the interest of the public service in St. Louis it would be unwise to put a million dollars into a building that will be arranged very largely to accommodate the independent treasury system and then have that portion of the building practically worthless for any other purpose.

They arrange a subtreasury as they arrange a banking office, and you can not use it for meat inspection, for engineers, or for weather bureaus, or for the Mississippi River Commission, or anything like that. My own opinion is that, if the Government service at St. Louis needs additional facilities and accommodations, the interest of the Government would be served by postponement until it could be known just what is to be done about the subtreasury, so that when a building is constructed

it will be one that will be suitable to the needs of the Government.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Chairman, I recognize the force of what the gentleman from New York says, but will he accept a suggestion? Of course, I appreciate that it will be a change of existing law and subject to a point of order. But I trust the point of order will not be made, owing to the urgent circumstances under which we are suffering in St. Louis. I suggest that we strike out the word "subtreasury" and insert in lieu thereof the words "United States Government building for Federal offices."

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, that would not do any good, because there is no such building authorized. The gentleman has been chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and he knows that it is absolutely inconceivable that I should consent to an amendment on this bill that would completely change the character of the building that is authorized. It may be, if there is to be no subtreasury there, that a building that would be suitable for other purposes would not cost anything like \$1,000,000. The site cost \$300,000, but that is no reason why we should expend \$1,000,000 for a building upon that site, just to make it look as though we had expended a proportionate amount for the building.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Chairman, the site for this building was purchased about five years ago, and it has almost become a joke in St. Louis. Everybody is pointing to it, and everybody in the city knows that the site has been purchased for a Federal building, and yet for five long years we have had to wait. If you strike it out now, it will throw us back another year or more.

Mr. FITZGERALD. But you might get a building that you really ought to have rather than one that you would not need. They might have to start in and buy another site to put up another building, if we constructed this building at this time.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Perhaps the gentleman has not heard what I said, that the subtreasury, in case it should be decided to continue the subtreasury system, might well be located on the ground floor of the present post office.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Then, why not put it there now?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. They could put it in there.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That was the chief reason for putting up this building. Why not put it in there and eliminate any necessity for the building?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. But we would not gain any space for the Federal service in St. Louis, which is absolutely necessary now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. IGOE. Mr. Chairman, the situation in regard to this subtreasury is just simply this: When the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill was under consideration during this present session questions were asked as to the future of that system, and an amendment, as I recollect it, was laid aside at that time, because it was thought that in December of this year the Treasury Department would be able to tell us what it intended to do with that system. Subtreasury quarters in St. Louis are in the old Federal building, and they need new quarters. Something should be done to improve present conditions if the subtreasury system is to remain. We would all like to have a fine new Government building in St. Louis, but I do not see how this Government, as a business proposition, can go ahead intelligently with this plan until we know what the building is to be used for. It is true, as the gentleman from Missouri, Dr. BARTHOLDT, says, that we have a great many Government offices scattered all over the city, and an office building would be a saving to the Government, but I do not believe a three-story office building would do at all. If we are to have a subtreasury system, I believe this building should be constructed, and so constructed as to provide quarters for the Subtreasury, and then offices for the accommodation not only of Government offices there in St. Louis now that are in rented quarters, but for additional offices that may be there in the near future. If the subtreasury system is to be abolished, there is no sense in going ahead now and designing a building that would be of no use whatever. Later on, perhaps, the Congress will give us the money to construct an office building on that site. Therefore, in view of the circumstances, I believe we can afford to wait until the next bill comes in, in the hope that we may know something definite about the subtreasury system.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I think that they are probably in need of a new Federal building at St. Louis for the Government offices, and I am heartily in favor of giving them such a building as they need there. When the site was purchased for the subtreasury building several years ago at St. Louis no one suspected that the subtreasury was likely to be abolished; and when the authorization was made for the subtreasury building

at St. Louis, it was not expected that in the immediate future the subtreasury building might not be needed for subtreasury purposes. We are told that in all probability there will be some arrangement worked out by which the Federal reserve banks will do the work now performed by the sub or independent treasuries. It can not be any possible reflection upon the distinguished Members of this House who represent St. Louis and the rest of Missouri to postpone the commencement of a subtreasury building for a year, at least, in order that we may ascertain whether the new building shall be constructed for subtreasury purposes or shall be of a different type and be constructed for general office purposes for other Federal offices. A subtreasury building, with its vaults, is very different from the character of building required for the other governmental offices. If next winter it has been determined that the subtreasury shall continue, it will be easy enough then to make provision for the construction of that building. If next winter it has been determined that the subtreasury shall be abolished, it will not meet with much opposition, I dare say, if the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds should report a bill providing that this site shall be used for a Federal building for other purposes instead of for a subtreasury building, as heretofore authorized. It seems to me, then, a matter of good, common business sense for us to postpone the commencement of the subtreasury building, and I am sure that no Member here would vote to postpone it if it in any way whatever reflected upon the character or ability or the fidelity of any of the Members from St. Louis, who all stand so well in the House. [Applause.]

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I am convinced that certain great centers, like St. Louis, having departments of the Government, active, administrative branches of the Government located therein for the convenience of the territory that is served by the city and its railroad connection and its trade, will eventually have to have a different type of building from the combined post office and customhouse buildings with which we are familiar, or from the subtreasury style of structure that is contemplated in this bill.

They will eventually need a type of building adapted for offices for the men in the Agricultural Department, the pure-food inspection, the inspection of locomotives and steamboats, the Department of Justice, the Engineering Board of the Army, and the Quartermaster's Department of the Army for the inspection of supplies, purchases, and so forth; and of these various departments that are centralized in certain great cities of the United States. When St. Louis asks for such a building or when the Government determines that one is needed there—and I think that time is practically here—it ought to have a building of that type, adapted to the business needs of the city. But I understand this building, which must have been contemplated more than five years ago, because the site was then purchased, was planned for a subtreasury. In design it is to be a heavy low structure, strongly built, designed for subtreasury purposes. Now, it is apparent that there is considerable doubt as to its ultimate use for subtreasury purposes, and there has grown a doubt in the minds of most Members here of its adaptability to the real purposes that will be demanded in the city of St. Louis. Therefore I intend to sustain and support, when the time comes, a business office building for St. Louis of a type like they have to have in the great centers. It would probably be a waste of Government money at this time, which the St. Louis people would not justify or expect, to go ahead with these plans which have been so materially altered by the creation of the Federal Reserve Board.

Mr. MARTIN. I would like to ask the gentleman what use, if any, is to be made of the large building, or the lower floor of the large building, originally the post office and court building, at St. Louis?

Mr. BORLAND. I could not answer that question.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I can answer the gentleman's question. That is going to be utilized for the post-office inspectors and several of the officials who are now in the office and have insufficient accommodation. In other words, the post office being moved out to the new building, we have not gained any space in the office which we could not put to use.

Mr. BORLAND. I know this to be the fact, if the gentleman will permit, that the ordinary type of post office and customhouse is not adapted for ordinary business office purposes. It has dark hallways and high ceilings. That kind of a building does not combine readily with ordinary business purposes and it is very difficult to adapt the ordinary post-office building for office purposes.

Mr. MARTIN. I have some acquaintance with St. Louis, and my recollection is that it is a large building that covers probably an entire block, and it occurs to me that if by any chance the subtreasury should be continued at St. Louis it would not be

at all impracticable that the space on this lower floor could be very well adapted for subtreasury purposes. It is located in the best business portion of the city and it certainly has area enough to be adapted to subtreasury uses if that should be undertaken.

Mr. GILL. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman that the subtreasury is in that building now and the lower floor of that building is occupied by a subpost office of the downtown district, and money-order department, and other offices of that kind. That building is all filled. We have 21 offices outside the Government building in the city of St. Louis.

Mr. MARTIN. This building covers an entire block, does it not?

Mr. GILL. This building covers an entire block.

Mr. MARTIN. Does the gentleman say the entire quarters have been occupied by the post office at St. Louis?

Mr. GILL. By the internal revenue, money-order department, savings banks, and offices for the post-office business, revenue department, Department of Justice—

Mr. MARTIN. Is the subtreasury now in that building?

Mr. GILL. Yes; it is in that building.

Mr. MARTIN. Could not the first story be adapted to the subtreasury use and give ample room?

Mr. GILL. Why, it could with the expenditure of a little money, and the Federal reserve could have rooms fixed up for them in that building that would be as good as there are in the United States; but we have offices in other buildings besides that of the Government building, but to build a building such as has been stated here, a little, low, massive structure that would not house—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GILL. I ask that I may have another minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GILL. I am in favor of striking out the \$50,000 until such time as we can get a building that will be suitable for such purposes we want it for, and I believe the Government will save about half a million dollars on the proposition.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I fully recognize the force of what has been said. The bill will fortunately not affect the original authorization, in which naturally I have taken a great deal of personal pride. I initiated this project in the committee, and Congress was kind enough to pass it some years ago, and I believed upon my retirement from Congress I might in the future have an opportunity to point to the subtreasury building as one of the monuments to my services rendered in Congress. I believe that is quite human and natural; but under the circumstances, since there is such a great uncertainty as to whether the subtreasury service will be continued or not, I appreciate that it would be a wise business policy to find out first what the Government is going to do with the subtreasury and then go ahead. The authorization for the building is already the law and will not and can not be affected no matter what we do to-day. In other words, I wish to assure the people of St. Louis with these few words that by this postponement nothing is lost to them except a year's delay. For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I yield, though reluctantly, to the sentiment of the committee and to circumstances over which I have no control. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

During the fiscal year 1916 all proceeds derived from work performed by the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, by direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, not covered and embraced in the appropriation for said bureau for the said fiscal year, instead of being covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, as provided by the act of August 4, 1886 (24 Stats., p. 227), be credited when received to the appropriation for said bureau for the fiscal year 1916.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph. I confess I do not quite understand just what is intended to be accomplished by this paragraph. Does the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, by direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, do a lot of outside work for which it is paid?

Mr. FITZGERALD. It does certain work for other governmental departments, and they pay for it. The appropriation for the work is made for the other departments, so that unless some such provision as this were carried the Bureau of Engraving and Printing would be short the amount that it would receive from those sources. It gets, altogether, about \$800,000 for work executed for other departments, chiefly for postage stamps. The director of the bureau has bid in competition with outsiders for the postage-stamp contract, and last year he received \$742,778.53 from it. He makes a profit on that contract and yet does the work more cheaply for the Post Office Department than anyone else offers to do it.

Mr. MANN. What is the situation now? If the Bureau of Engraving and Printing does \$800,000 worth of work for the Post Office Department, and the Post Office Department pays that to the bureau, and then it is turned into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, how does the bureau succeed in paying its expenses?

Mr. FITZGERALD. This authorization has been carried since he commenced to do that work. They asked that it be made permanent law, but we carry it every year in the bill so as to attract the attention of the committee and to inquire regarding the character of the work done and the amount received for such services. If there were a permanent provision it would soon be lost sight of and no one would know just what was being done there.

Mr. MANN. Does not the gentleman think there is a slight omission in this paragraph? Should not the word "shall" be inserted before the word "be," in line 22, after the word "twenty-seven," so that it will read:

Shall be credited.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The word "shall" would be proper there, but it has been carried in this way and has done no harm, and we have saved the expense of printing the word "shall."

Mr. MANN. I withdraw the point of order and move to insert in line 22, before the word "be," the word "shall." That makes it grammatically correct. I suppose it would do without it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 35, line 22, before the word "be," insert the word "shall."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

MISCELLANEOUS OBJECTS, TREASURY DEPARTMENT.

To enable the Secretary of the Treasury to refund money covered into Treasury as internal-revenue collections, under the provisions of the act approved May 27, 1908, \$50,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 36, line 5, by inserting as a new paragraph:

"For the construction of a permanent wagon-and-foot bridge across the creek at International Avenue, Nogales, Ariz., on land reserved by the United States for customs purposes, \$10,000."

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York reserves a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment under the head of "Miscellaneous objects, Treasury Department," at the request of the mayor of Nogales, Ariz. In order to explain the necessity for this appropriation I desire to say that in order to facilitate the collection of customs duties in 1892 the International Boundary Commission made the following recommendation respecting the boundary at Nogales:

That a reservation of not less than 50 feet in width be declared by the United States to extend along the entire length of the boundary on the American side, and that the Republic of Mexico be asked to declare a like reservation on the Mexican side, and that the erection of buildings on either side of the line within these limits be prohibited by law: *Provided, however,* That such reservation might be used for public streets or highways.

In 1897 the President, by proclamation, reserved a strip of land 60 feet wide by 2 miles long on the American side of the international boundary, a part of which was at that time covered with buildings. The buildings were torn down by direction of the Government in all cases where the occupants of the land did not remove them. I might add in this connection that the citizens of the United States who owned these buildings have never been compensated for the damages they sustained. They were occupying this ground under what everybody considered to be perfect title derived from a grant made by the Mexican Government. However, that has nothing to do with this appropriation, except to show that the United States has not been liberal in its treatment of the people of Nogales.

The mayor of Nogales writes as follows in regard to the necessity for this bridge:

The Government has never spent one solitary dollar for improvements of any kind whatsoever upon said international strip. The town has kept up the streets and bridges of one sort or another upon said strip and the principal use of said bridge is for the benefit of the Customs Service, which is strictly a United States institution.

The necessity for the bridge is very apparent, for the reason that there is a 16-foot wall the entire distance from the international bound-

ary line to the first bridge, which the town erected in 1913, a distance of over 500 feet down the stream. You have proof of this through the recommendation of the collector at this port, showing the advantages of said bridge, who approved our petition.

The international strip was created for the convenience of the Customs Service in order that smuggling might better be prevented. A creek that heads in old Mexico crosses this strip at an angle, and when the creek is in flood it is impossible to pass from one part of the boundary strip to the other. For this reason the people of Nogales believe that there ought to be a bridge not only for their convenience, but in order to properly carry out the duties of the Customs Service at that port of entry. For these reasons I offer this amendment.

An estimate of cost has been prepared by the mayor of Nogales, who is an engineer by profession, for the construction of a bridge about 50 feet wide, including the necessary stone or concrete work to protect the banks of the creek from being washed away. Owing to a curve in the creek the bridge will be at an angle which makes the construction more expensive than it otherwise would be. I am satisfied, however, that everything that is necessary to be done can be accomplished within the sum that I have named in this amendment.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. With pleasure.

Mr. MANN. Who would make use of the bridge?

Mr. HAYDEN. Everybody who lives in Nogales—the people and the Government officials. It is as much needed for the Customs Service as for the citizens of that city.

Mr. MANN. Where would they go on the bridge?

Mr. HAYDEN. Along the international boundary line. The towns of Nogales, Sonora, and Nogales, Ariz., are on each side of the boundary. This creek divides each town into two parts.

Mr. MANN. Is this to build a bridge extending from the United States into Mexico?

Mr. HAYDEN. No, sir; parallel with the boundary of the United States; extending from one side of the creek to the other and entirely within the United States. This creek runs from the south, in old Mexico, to the north and crosses the boundary line, which runs east and west at that point.

Mr. MANN. I have no doubt that the gentleman is perfectly lucid in his statement. Sometimes it is difficult for me to understand a geographical description. The gentleman is always very clear, but I confess I do not quite get it.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York insist on his point of order?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use for, and in connection with, the enforcement of the laws relating to the Treasury Department and the several branches of the public service under its control, not exceeding at any one time four persons paid from the appropriation for the collection of customs, four persons paid from the appropriation for salaries and expenses of internal-revenue agents or from the appropriation for the foregoing purpose, and four persons paid from the appropriation for suppressing counterfeiting and other crimes, but not exceeding six persons so detailed shall be employed at any one time hereunder: *Provided,* That nothing herein contained shall be construed to deprive the Secretary of the Treasury from making any detail now otherwise authorized by existing law.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order. I would like to inquire of the gentleman from New York what the purpose is and what the effect is of this language in the paragraph in reference to the employment of persons paid from different appropriations? This provides that four persons may be used by the Secretary of the Treasury and paid from the appropriation for the collection of customs, four persons paid from the appropriation for internal revenue, four persons paid from the appropriation for suppressing counterfeiting and other crimes, and not exceeding six persons shall be employed at any one time under these provisions. Of course these are details, but I would like to ask the gentleman what the detailed employees have to do, if the gentleman happens to remember?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I think they do not make any of these details just now. The gentleman from Illinois will recall the circumstances that resulted in this provision. Some years ago it was found that the Secret Service agents were being utilized in ways that it was not believed desirable, or that Congress ever intended that they should be used, and after conference with the department this provision was worked out, so as to permit them to be used only to a limited extent.

The purpose of the provision is to stop a movement which from time to time gets some momentum in this country proposing to build up a great Federal secret police force by the consolidation of all the various services of the Federal Government which are used along lines similar to a secret police service. There are a number of such services in the Federal Government.

There is the Secret Service, so called, the internal-revenue agents, the fiscal agents in the Customs Service, the post-office inspectors, the special agents in the Department of Labor, and many others that I do not now recall. From time to time it is proposed that legislation be enacted to put all of these services under one control. I have omitted two of the more important services, and one is the agents employed in the Department of Justice for the prevention and detection of crime, and the other special agents employed in the Interior Department in connection with the prevention of depredations on the public lands.

Nearly every year the Treasury Department makes a more or less vigorous protest against any restrictions being placed upon the use of the Secret Service agents in any manner. The committee is of the opinion that the experience of the past justifies this limitation, believing that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. It is designed to effect a very beneficial purpose.

Mr. MANN. May I ask the gentleman, does anyone know or has anyone ever taken the trouble to make a computation as to how many Secret Service officials the Government has under the various designations in the different departments?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; my recollection as to the fact is that some years ago it was shown that the appropriations aggregated nearly \$9,000,000 available for all the various services for what might be characterized as secret agents.

Mr. MANN. It was said at one time in the press, if not elsewhere, that some of this money was being used for the purpose of watching Members of Congress. I suppose none of it is now being used to corral or gather up or hold together Members of the body at the other end of the Capitol.

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; with the great acquisition of Democrats to Congress, the morale has necessarily improved to such an extent that it is not necessary to keep them under surveillance, as it might have been necessary heretofore. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. Either that or they gave it up as a hopeless task. [Laughter.] Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, I read from what the gentleman from Illinois, leader of the minority, said yesterday, that he interpreted what I said as a reflection upon his character. I am sure I never intended anything of the sort. On the contrary, I never have known in all my life a man, in my opinion, who has been as painstaking, as careful, and as conscientious in his public duties as has the gentleman from Illinois. [Applause.]

The gentleman from Illinois, notwithstanding that, from a freak of temper, which he displays occasionally, causes him to make an astonishing remark now and then. He did say yesterday:

The statement the gentleman makes, like most of his statements, is absolutely without any foundation of fact.

Well, technically there might be some ground for that statement. But the pith of my statement was the extravagance of the appropriation for Wilmington, N. C., and it was immaterial or extraneous what I said to him about the committee. It is true, and not original with me, the statement was made on the floor that when the bill was introduced carrying some forty-odd million dollars, knowing the gentleman's tenacity and fighting qualities to pass upon all matters that were extravagant, when that bill came in on the famous 17th of February, 1913, he was present. But he became mute and silent, and the bill was passed with him remaining in that condition of mind. That is a statement of fact. That is true. I should say that his first statement yesterday was out of order without recognition or appeal to the Chair for recognition. His second statement was made a little later on, when he got the floor afterwards. He said:

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman, with his usual style, is proceeding, notwithstanding that I declined to yield. The gentleman does not know a misstatement from a correct statement.

Just before he said again that "if it hadn't been for the statement of the gentleman in his usual style and rather coarse, it seems to me"—coarse? Mr. Chairman, to tell the truth, is that coarse? That was all that was said, and, my God, if there is anything permissible, it is to tell the truth.

That was all. He was silent when that \$41,000,000 appropriation bill went through that day, from beginning to end. The proverbial oyster was never more silent. I believe he did rise from his seat when the gentleman from Malden, Mass., got piqued because the appropriation was not large enough, and he was going to sulk, but the gentleman from Illinois suggested that he better let it pass. That is the only explanation. The point is this, that the appropriation was extravagant, was extraordinary and wasteful, and lacked all business common sense. Since that time, to show you that it was considered in that

respect, I asked the chairman of the committee a question, and while he said he could answer in a public statement 66½ per cent of my question, yet it was argued in favor of the proposition that it was needed for customs purposes, and so forth. Inquiry in this connection would have shown there was no customs business, practically nothing.

The real customs business amounted to about \$5,000, and the total amount of business was about \$28,000. Tonnage and navigation there can not put the town into the \$600,000-building class. They have four officials, a deputy collector, a clerk, an inspector, and a man that receives his pay by the day. Three hundred thousand dollars they added to that bill to house that crew of four people. It costs the Government 25 cents for every dollar it collects there. If the bill had been properly considered, with the usual vigilance on the part of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], it might not have happened. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations was present and took part, and the bill went through. Not once during that day did they object to that \$600,000 appropriation for Wilmington, N. C.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, the point of the whole talk was that it was an extravagant appropriation, and the reference to the committee was immaterial and was of no concern. The great chairman of the Committee on Appropriations one day in making a motion here just quietly told me that I was not running this House, that he was running the House, and therefore he is responsible for the bad business that was done in that particular transaction.

Now, in regard to the charge of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] that I spoke out of order, I admit that, and I apologize to the House, and I am extremely sorry to think that it had been necessary for me to speak out of order; but I have gotten into that habit from being a constant Member here and from hearing and seeing the gentleman from Illinois carry on parliamentary procedure.

The Clerk read as follows:

Recoinage of minor coins: To enable the Secretary of the Treasury to continue the recoinage of worn and uncurrent minor coin of the United States now in the Treasury or hereafter received, and to reimburse the Treasurer of the United States for the difference between the nominal or face value of such coin and the amount the same will produce in new coin, \$10,000.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Does the gentleman from New York know how much of these short-weight coins are recoined in a year? The recoinage of gold coins carries an appropriation of \$5,000, which for the current year is \$3,000, and the recoinage of the minor coins carries an appropriation of \$10,000. Is there any report in the hands of the committee as to the number of gold coins recoined during the last fiscal year, or the number of minor coins that are recoined, that are of short weight?

Mr. FITZGERALD. On minor coins at the mint the amount is \$72,174.31, and in the subtreasury \$93,560. On current gold in the several subtreasuries on February 1, 1915, \$983,812.50.

Mr. MANN. That is the amount of money involved?

Mr. FITZGERALD. It does not show the number of coins. They are in varying denominations, and I think they do not keep track of them by numbers. They do by weight and value.

Mr. MANN. What short-weight coins do they recoin? Of course the Government does not undertake to take every short-weight coin that is presented, as I understand it?

Mr. FITZGERALD. My recollection is that section 3512 of the Revised Statutes fixes a tolerance and prohibits the reissue whenever the coin falls below a certain weight.

Mr. MANN. I supposed the practice was for the Government to refuse to take the coins which are light weight.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, they do take them.

Mr. MANN. I think if the gentleman were to collect a lot of light-weight coins and go to the subtreasury with them, he would find that they would not take them.

Mr. FITZGERALD. They either take them or make an allowance on the gold coins; I am not sure which.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Money laundry machines: For all miscellaneous expenses in connection with the installation and maintenance of money laundry machines, including repairs and purchase of supplies, for machines at Washington, D. C., and in the various subtreasury offices, \$9,000.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. For several years we have had some statements on the

floor of this House with reference to these money laundry machines. Has the gentleman any new information on the subject? That is one of the interesting experiments which the Government has made. Is it perfectly successful?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, there is no new information. They are being used, though not used to their capacity. A great many notes, however, are washed annually and returned to circulation. When the machines were first used there was very considerable opposition, either real or stimulated, to the washed notes. I always believed that it was a stimulated opposition. It was believed if these machines would perhaps make reissuable so many notes, it might affect the work of printing the notes. This year there did not seem to be any evidence that banks or business houses were objecting to these washed notes. During the last fiscal year 35,438,713 notes of various denominations were laundered. The cost of printing new notes and putting them in circulation is \$13.12½ a thousand. The cost of laundering and returning to circulation is approximately \$3.19 per thousand, or a saving of \$9.93 per thousand. So that the saving is very considerable. We launder some notes which, after being laundered, are not issued because the effect of the laundering on them indicates that they are too much worn; but undoubtedly a very considerable number of notes have been made serviceable which before the introduction of the laundry machines were discarded because of the manner in which they had been soiled. I think it is not only useful in that it cleans the notes and extends the life, but it enables the currency to be kept in much better condition for general purposes.

Mr. MANN. How many notes did the gentleman say had been laundered?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Thirty-five million four hundred and thirty-eight thousand seven hundred and thirteen.

Mr. MANN. In one fiscal year?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. MANN. And it costs in the neighborhood of \$3 a thousand?

Mr. FITZGERALD. It costs to launder \$3.19 a thousand.

Mr. MANN. Three dollars a thousand with \$9,000 appropriated would launder less than 3,000,000 notes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Nine thousand dollars is for two purposes. When the machines were first obtained there was a very considerable stock of supplies for them, and those supplies have been exhausted. My recollection is that this provides only for supplies. The operators are carried in the legislative bill.

Mr. MANN. And repairs, and so forth?

Mr. FITZGERALD. And is not for personal services at all.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, occasionally we adopt a new policy in the Government service that works well and is really in the interest of economy. The policy of laundering notes seems to be such a policy. During the hearings I asked Mr. Thompson, who appeared before the committee:

Mr. MONDELL. What was the estimated saving by the use of the laundry machines?

Mr. THOMPSON. If the life of a laundered note is the same as the life of a new note it would be about \$9 a thousand, and on the 35,000,000 notes washed last year it would be about \$350,000; but the actuary has been unable to determine up to this time whether the life of a laundered note is equal to the life of a new note or not.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you find the same objection now as formerly to these washed notes?

Mr. THOMPSON. We now receive no complaints at all, to my knowledge.

The CHAIRMAN. That has all died out?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. MALBURN. I do not think the average man would know the difference.

Mr. MONDELL. Do you ever wash a note the second time?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes; in fact, we do not know.

Mr. MONDELL. You do not know when a note comes back whether it has been laundered or not?

Mr. THOMPSON. Sometimes we find notes that we can tell have been laundered. The employees who are familiar with the laundry work can tell better than others. They find sometimes that laundered notes come back, and they run them through again and put them out, and I imagine there are a good many notes that have been laundered and come in and gone out a second time.

The plan of washing notes seems to be successful and satisfactory, and does apparently save quite a considerable sum of money in the course of a year.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the gentleman from New York in reference to this laundering of money, what has been the report from the banks and institutions that handle a large number of notes after it has been laundered?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Last year there was evidence that an attempt had been made to create considerable objection to the use of the laundered notes. The committee thought then that it was a stimulated opposition. This year there is no evidence of it, but it is very difficult to tell the laundered note from one that was not laundered unless it is compared with a note that is so soiled that it is apparent.

Mr. FOSTER. I understand that there was a great deal of complaint about these notes for a time.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I think it was stimulated.

Mr. FOSTER. Last year there were complaints from the State of New York, the State of Illinois, a lot of bankers, and so forth.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It died out.

Mr. FOSTER. And there is no more complaint?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; not at this session.

Mr. FOSTER. I had not heard any; I did not know what the gentleman might know on the subject.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It was due, I think, to the belief that the laundered notes would be of quite so extensive a character that it might very materially reduce the output of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, and there was a natural desire on the part of some persons that that should not be effected. The increased demands of commerce and the growth of the country, I think, will maintain the demand for notes and will not materially affect the output of the bureau, but the laundering will make available an additional supply of a not very great amount.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to state that debate on this amendment is exhausted.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. A moment ago the gentleman from Illinois inquired with reference to the recoining of light-weight gold coins. It is a matter that may be of some interest to Members. Section 3505 of the Revised Statutes provides:

SEC. 3505. Any gold coins of the United States, if reduced in weight by natural abrasion not more than one-half of 1 per cent below the standard weight prescribed by law, after a circulation of 20 years, as shown by the date of coinage, and at a ratable proportion for any period less than 20 years, shall be received at their nominal value by the United States Treasury and its offices, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe for the protection of the Government against fraudulent abrasion or other practices.

Section 3512 of the Revised Statutes provides:

SEC. 3512. Any gold coins in the Treasury of the United States when reduced in weight by natural abrasion more than one-half of 1 per cent below the standard weight prescribed by law shall be recoined.

These two provisions of the Revised Statutes cover the subject about which the gentleman inquires. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Distinctive paper for United States securities: For distinctive paper for United States securities, not less than 73,500,000 sheets, and for national-bank currency and Federal reserve bank currency, not less than 13,500,000 sheets, including transportation, traveling, mill, and other necessary expenses, salaries of not exceeding 1 register, 2 assistant registers, 5 counters, 5 watchmen, and 1 skilled laborer, and expenses of officer detailed from the Treasury, \$415,000.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask about several of the items in this section which have been omitted from the bill and to know where the amounts are now carried. For the current year we made an appropriation of \$70,000 for distinctive paper under the head of "Expenses of national currency, etc." Is that carried now in some other place? We also made appropriation of \$1,565 for pay of the committee that witnesses the destruction of Government securities. Where is that carried? And then we made an appropriation of \$8,400 for the custody of dies, rolls, and plates. May I ask where those items are carried?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The provision for the custody of dies, rolls, and plates was transferred to the item of salaries of employees, Bureau of Engraving and Printing. That puts the employees directly under the Bureau of Engraving and Printing rather than under the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. MANN. That is, on the legislative bill.

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; that is in this bill. The gentleman will find, on page 34, for "salaries of all necessary employees," in line 8, "including \$8,400 for the custody of dies, rolls, and plates." That is transferred from the Treasury Department to the Bureau of Engraving and Printing. Formerly there were items for "distinctive paper for United States securities" and "distinctive paper for national currency," and the two have been combined in a single paragraph, with a limitation upon the number of sheets for each class of paper. Part of the expense of these persons employed in the mills is paid from one appropriation and part from the other. But as this is for securing the same kind of paper it seemed proper that the provision for this distinctive paper should be in one item, and then the number of sheets being stated for both classes of currency makes effective the purposes in view.

Mr. MANN. Well, we appropriated for the current law \$400,000 for distinctive paper for United States and \$70,000 for the national-bank currency. I can see why those two items might probably be combined as has been done in the bill, but it attracted my attention, because I had supposed that likely that would be an extra expense this year for the issuance of Federal bank reserve notes. That was a reduction of \$55,000 in the

appropriation. The appropriation in the current law may have been larger than heretofore to cover Federal reserve notes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. A great many were printed during the current year, I think. The committee recommended this method of designating the number of sheets for what it was believed the ordinary normal business conditions of the country would require. Of course, if an extraordinary situation should arise, Congress would provide for it.

Mr. MANN. I understand that, there being less money in circulation now than usual, you thought it was not necessary to print so much new money. I can understand that.

Mr. FITZGERALD. They have enough for normal conditions. If any unusual condition should arise, Congress will be expected to meet it by providing for the unusual condition.

Mr. MANN. May I ask, then, about the destruction of Government securities? Is the public no longer to be represented on that committee?

Mr. FITZGERALD. That has not been provided for. The Treasury Department requested that that be made an annual position and carried in the legislative bill. The legislative bill passed the House without any provision being made for the position. That bill has not been reported to the Senate yet, but it is expected that the provision will be made, either in this bill or in the legislative bill.

Mr. MANN. At the next session of Congress.

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; at this session of Congress.

Mr. MANN. Vain hope!

Mr. FITZGERALD. Provided these bills become laws at this session, and if I can have my way I will do everything in my power to have these appropriation bills become laws at this session.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. I ask unanimous consent for another minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that his time be extended one minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. As I understand, the gentleman is still having looked up the question of the language to be used?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I have to inquire of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing. I will do that before the bill is completed. I have no doubt there will be no objection to returning to it to make any correction necessary.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, in order to make it clear just what the situation is with regard to this representative of the public to witness the destruction by maceration of Government securities, let me say, as the chairman has stated, the Secretary of the Treasury recommended that this be made an annual position and be placed in the legislative bill. It was not placed in the legislative bill. As a matter of fact, I doubt the wisdom of so doing. If the public is to be represented, I think the provision we have made heretofore is a very excellent provision. Heretofore we have paid \$5 a day for the days that the representative was actually employed in this work. My understanding is that a young lady employed in the Treasury Department has been detailed to do this work and to be the witness for the people of this work of maceration. I do not know whether it is necessary or not. I do not know just how much more certain we are that these notes are all macerated because this representative is there. My idea is that the Treasury Department does not consider it a very important matter. My personal opinion is that the item ought to be in the bill, but as the committee struck it out I shall not offer an amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in regard to the item for distinctive paper for United States securities, it developed in the hearings that there was quite an accumulation of this paper, and that the total of the estimate for the two combined items might very properly be considered reduced. There was some discussion of the matter that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has referred to, as to the proper phraseology to be used in describing the paper for the printing of the issues under the Federal reserve law. There will be two classes of issues under the new Federal reserve law. One is the Federal reserve bank notes issued by the Federal reserve banks. The other is the Federal reserve currency issued instead of the national-bank currency by or on behalf of the member banks. It would seem very proper to refer to one as Federal reserve notes and the other as Federal reserve currency. Those terms would distinguish the two classes of issues and describe them with reasonable accuracy, and it is very evident that we should consider that matter, as has been suggested, and arrange the language of the paragraph with a view of having the classes of this paper provided for in the item now under consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Suppressing counterfeiting and other crimes: For expenses incurred under the authority or with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury in detecting, arresting, and delivering into the custody of the United States marshal having jurisdiction dealers and pretended dealers in counterfeit money and persons engaged in counterfeiting Treasury notes, bonds, national-bank notes, and other securities of the United States and of foreign Governments, as well as the coins of the United States and of foreign Governments, and other felonies committed against the laws of the United States relating to the pay and bounty laws, hire and operation of motor-propelled or horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles when necessary, per diem in lieu of subsistence, when allowed pursuant to section 13 of the sundry civil appropriation act approved August 1, 1914, and for no other purpose whatever, except in the protection of the person of the President and of the person chosen to be President of the United States, \$145,000: *Provided*, That no part of this amount be used in defraying the expenses of any person subpoenaed by the United States courts to attend any trial before a United States court or preliminary examination before any United States commissioner, which expenses shall be paid from the appropriation for "Fees of witnesses, United States courts."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. When the Agricultural appropriation bill was under consideration some question arose as to certain printing presses used in the Forest Service. The question was raised by my friend from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY], and I promised at that time to get the information.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. If the gentleman will yield, I did not hear what he said this was about.

Mr. LEVER. About the printing-press matter to which the gentleman called my attention. I desire to extend my remarks by printing in the RECORD certain statements furnished by the Forest Service.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks leave to extend his remarks by printing in the RECORD certain documents. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The documents referred to are as follows:

To handle small jobs of field printing needed quickly, the Ogden supply depot of the Forest Service is equipped with a small job-printing press, operated by motor but fed by hand. One member of the office force, who is an experienced printer, handles the composition and press-work, incidental to other duties. A large part of the work done is the printing of letterheads for the individual forests. To lessen the time consumed in feeding the letter sheets individually to the machine it was desired, if possible, to secure an automatic feeder. Self-feeders are not in common use on presses as small as that at Ogden, but it was learned after careful inquiry that four feeders, which gave promise of answering the requirements, were being operated in Richmond. An employee of the Washington office, C. M. Ballard, was sent to Richmond to see whether the machine would do the work required satisfactorily. It was found that the feeder would not answer the need, and the contemplated purchase was therefore not considered further.

[Memorandum for Mr. LEVER.]

FEBRUARY 4, 1915.

Referring to the question raised in Congress regarding the authority of the Forest Service to own and operate a printing press at Ogden, I am glad to give you the following additional information.

The small printing press operated at Ogden was purchased in 1909 and the voucher duly passed by the Treasury. The Comptroller of the Treasury has ruled that the Forest Service "is a field service under the control of the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture, with its headquarters located at Washington, as distinguished from a part of the Department of Agriculture proper, and printing for such service is not 'printing' for an 'executive department' within the meaning of section 87 of the act of January 12, 1895, and is not required thereby to be done at the Government Printing Office." A copy of this ruling of the comptroller is inclosed.

A. F. POTTER, Associate Forester.

DECISION OF THE COMPTROLLER OF THE TREASURY, JULY, 1907-JUNE, 1908. [Vol. XIV, pp. 723-724.]

PRINTING FOR FOREST SERVICE.

The Forest Service is a field service under the control of the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture, with its headquarters located at Washington, as distinguished from a part of the Department of Agriculture proper, and printing for such service is not "printing" for an "executive department" within the meaning of section 87 of the act of January 12, 1895, and is not required thereby to be done at the Government Printing Office; neither is it "printing" for an executive department, or bureau or office thereof, or other Government establishment at Washington, within the meaning of section 2 of sundry civil act of June 30, 1906, and is not required thereby to be included in the annual estimates for printing and binding.

The appropriation "General expenses, Forest Service, 1908," is applicable to the payment of expenses incurred during fiscal year 1908 for printing in the field under duly authorized contract with private firms of official forms necessary for conduct of business in administration, protection, and improvement of the national forests.

[Comptroller Tracewell to the Secretary of Agriculture, April 29, 1908.]

I am in receipt of a communication from you, dated April 31, 1908, as follows:

"I have the honor to request your decision whether the appropriation for 'General expenses, Forest Service,' made by the act of March 4, 1907 (34 Stat., 1269), is available for expenses incurred for the printing in the field under duly authorized contract with private firms of official forms necessary for the conduct of business in the administration, protection, and improvement of national forests. I respectfully call attention to your decision of January 29, 1908, that the Forest Service of this department is a field service and is not bound by section 8 of the act of January 12, 1895, to have its printing and binding done at the Government Printing Office."

The Forest Service, extending throughout the States and Territories of the United States, is, in my opinion, a field service under the control

of the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture (act of Feb. 1, 1905, 33 Stat., 628), with its headquarters located at Washington, as distinguished from a part of the Department of Agriculture proper, and therefore printing for the use of such service is not "printing" for an "executive department" within the meaning of section 87 of the act of January 12, 1895 (28 Stat., 622), and is not required by such section to be done at the Government Printing Office; neither is it "printing" for an executive department, or bureau or office thereof, or other Government establishment at Washington, within the meaning of section 2 of the sundry civil act of June 30, 1906 (34 Stat., 697), and is not required by the provisions of such act to be submitted to Congress in the annual estimates of the expenses of printing and binding.

The appropriation "General expenses, Forest Service, 1908," in the act of March 4, 1907 (34 Stat., 1270), is, in my opinion, applicable to the payment of expenses incurred during the fiscal year 1908 for printing in the field under duly authorized contract with private firms of official forms necessary for the conduct of business in the administration, protection, and improvement of the national forests. (44 MS. Comp. Dec., 551, Jan. 29, 1908; id., 493, Jan. 27, 1908, 13 Comp. Dec., 639, 733.)

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. Can the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] state how many motors the Secret Service now has, and does the Secret Service maintain out of this appropriation the motor or motors which it uses in connection with guarding the President?

Mr. SHERLEY. The Secret Service has been renting an automobile at an annual rental of \$500 for use in connection with the protection of the President here in the District of Columbia. There was some question as to whether the law as it read authorized that proper expenditure in view of the hire and operation of the automobile, and this language was inserted in order to take care of the situation.

Mr. MANN. I asked because I did not know but that the one they used was one of the President's.

Mr. SHERLEY. No; there has been an arrangement by which a company has rented to the Secret Service men at a rental of \$500 a year an automobile for their use.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois. I want to ask the gentleman from Kentucky in relation to the language in lines 24 and 25, "hire and operation of motor-propelled or horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles when necessary," if that is considered all that is required in connection with the law that was passed in the last session of Congress that prohibited money being used for this purpose unless specifically authorized.

Mr. SHERLEY. I think that is sufficient to authorize the expenditure of this money.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. My recollection is that when the Indian bill and later the Agriculture bill and the military appropriation bill were up it was contended that the amount must be specifically authorized, and that was the form in which the limitation was placed in these bills. If I understand this language, \$145,000 might be expended for this purpose—there is no limitation.

Mr. SHERLEY. My remembrance of the provision of the law to which the gentleman refers was that it required that an estimate should be submitted. But there is nothing that would require, in a provision such as this, a limitation on the amount of money that should be expended.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I am inclined to agree with the gentleman, but my recollection is that in the other bills I have mentioned there was an express limitation as to how much could be expended for this purpose, namely, "hire and operation of motor-propelled or horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles."

Mr. SHERLEY. I will say to the gentleman that in some of the bills there was an express limitation of the amount and in some cases in this bill there is a limitation, but it did not seem wise to the committee in this particular matter to fix a limitation on the Secret Service men in the use of an automobile necessary for the protection of the President.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. At the same time, the gentleman will acknowledge that if some Secretary of the Treasury wished to do so he could spend the whole amount carried in this paragraph for that purpose.

Mr. SHERLEY. Of course it is conceivable, but hardly within the realms of probability, and this provides for the hire and operation, and not for the purchase.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I realize that. Now, I want to ask the gentleman a further question. The language in line 1 on the next page is "per diem in lieu of subsistence." Will the gentleman tell us what that per diem is?

Mr. SHERLEY. In the sundry civil bill enacted at the last session there was the following provision:

SEC. 13. That the heads of executive departments and other Government establishments are authorized to prescribe per diem rates of allowance not exceeding \$4 in lieu of subsistence to persons engaged in field work or traveling on official business outside of the District of Columbia and away from their designated posts of duty when not otherwise

fixed by law. For the fiscal year 1916 and annually thereafter estimates of appropriations from which per diem allowances are to be paid shall specifically state the rates of such allowances.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. It might be \$4. Will the gentleman tell us whether or not there is a uniform per diem in the different departments in lieu of subsistence?

Mr. SHERLEY. There is a maximum not to exceed \$4.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Does that pertain to all departments of the Government?

Mr. SHERLEY. I think so; yes.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I think the gentleman is mistaken. My recollection is that it is \$5 in some departments and \$3 in some others, and \$4 in others. I have always thought that the amount ought to be uniform. It is \$4 in the Treasury Department. It ought not to be more in other departments.

Mr. SHERLEY. I think the gentleman is confusing cases in which they are allowed a certain sum in lieu of actual expenses, and these cases where they are paid an actual expense which shall not exceed \$5 a day.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Do I understand that where it provides it shall not exceed \$5 a day that if the expenses are only \$3 a day that is all they are allowed?

Mr. SHERLEY. If they are allowed the actual expenses.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. My understanding is that where the language authorizes the allowance to be not in excess of so much per day that that amount is arbitrarily given to them whether they expend it or not.

Mr. SHERLEY. That is in lieu of actual expenses.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, the provision to which reference has been made with regard to the hiring and operation of motor-propelled and horse-drawn vehicles in this item is different from that carried in most items in the bill, and, of course, there is a reason for it. This service was not estimated for, as they should have estimated the expected cost of the motor-propelled vehicle which they hire and use for the protection of the President, but in the hearing they informed us how much it cost them annually. But, in addition to that, this service needs authority to hire vehicles whenever they need them. I think it will appeal to every member of the committee that the Secret Service is likely to need the use of a vehicle at almost any time.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman think the language in the legislative bill for the current year in reference to automobiles covers the hiring of an automobile? The language reads:

Purchase, maintenance, repair, or operation.

Does that cover the hiring of an automobile or buggy?

Mr. MONDELL. I think the gentleman from Illinois can answer that question as well as anyone.

Mr. MANN. I asked because I thought perhaps that question had been raised in the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MONDELL. It was discussed.

Mr. MANN. This service has hired an automobile, and the law provided that as to the purchase, maintenance and repair, and operation of automobiles they should make an estimate.

Mr. MONDELL. As some of the other bureaus did not.

Mr. MANN. I do not say that they did not make an estimate because they neglected it or because they thought it was not required. The committee ignores specifically this proposition in the bill. May I ask whether, in the opinion of the committee, the language used in the legislative act in reference to automobiles or horse-drawn vehicles covers the question of hiring one for a day or for a year?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I do not recall that the question in just that form was before the committee, but possibly the presence of the language in this paragraph will answer that. The committee felt that without this language in the paragraph it was doubtful if they had authority to hire automobiles. Of course, all through the public service there are appropriations under which automobiles may be hired as a part of traveling expense, either on allotments made or on certification of actual traveling expenses. But the Secret Service sometimes needs a vehicle not in connection with travel of one of its members, and this language clearly gives them authority to hire a vehicle under those circumstances and conditions, and I should say that without a provision of this kind in the bill they would not be authorized to hire automobiles or carriages except as they might hire them as a part of traveling expenses. The only vehicle that they use regularly is one they hire for the protection of the President.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I had intended to ask some one in reference to the matter of hiring passenger-carrying vehicles. In a number of the appropriation bills there is authority to

purchase, maintain, and operate automobiles and passenger-carrying vehicles in considerable number in the field, and I have been wondering at odd times whether if those appropriations were stricken out it would make any difference to the service; in other words, whether they could use the same money for the hiring of these methods of transportation that they could for the maintenance of Government-owned ones if the Government did not appropriate for the maintenance. The language of the law which is new is:

There shall not be expended out of any appropriation made by Congress any sum for the purchase, maintenance, repair, or operation of a motor-propelled or horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicle for any branch of the public service of the United States unless the same is specifically authorized by law.

There is no specific authorization by law for the maintenance or the hiring or the use of these automobiles and other passenger-carrying vehicles, except as is carried in the appropriation bills. The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] suggests that they might hire an automobile as a part of their traveling expenses. They can not do that, if hiring is covered by this language, because the language of the law is that they shall not maintain, operate, or repair an automobile or other passenger-carrying vehicle unless it is specifically authorized by law. The allowance for traveling expenses would not be a specific authorization. I am inclined to think, myself, that the language in the law does not cover hiring an automobile or a buggy or other passenger-carrying vehicles at all, whether it should be hired for a day or a year. Of course, if it should be hired for a year, and get to be an abuse, undoubtedly the Committee on Appropriations or some other committee would try to take care of it. I do not think the law contemplates forbidding one of the departments, when it sends a man out, from hiring an automobile or a buggy in the transaction of his business. It is possible that it may lead to an abuse. Of course, the committee in this case now pending did not want to leave any question of doubt about it, but I suspect that what the Secret Service will do is to buy an automobile, and perhaps that is a thing they ought to do. I do not say that it is not.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. But this does not authorize them to buy it.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Appropriations in this act shall not be used in payment of compensation or expenses of any person detailed or transferred from the Secret Service Division of the Treasury Department, or who may at any time during the fiscal year 1916 have been employed by or under said Secret Service Division.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. If I understand this paragraph, a person in the Secret Service, or who may have been in the Secret Service at any time during the fiscal year 1916, if he should be transferred to any other department, could not be paid from any appropriation carried in this bill. I notice on page 36, lines 11 to 24, there is a provision authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to use for and in connection with the enforcement of the laws relating to the Treasury Department and the several branches of the public service under his control not exceeding a certain number of persons that are named, and in line 18 there is to be found "and four persons paid from the appropriation for suppressing counterfeiting and other crimes." It would seem to me that the paragraph on page 39 just read by the Clerk is inconsistent with the provision that I have read on page 36.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, the provision authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to use in the enforcement of the laws relating to the Treasury Department a certain number of Secret Service employees was designed to enable them to detail a certain number of men in some special case, like that of investigating a matter growing out of the mint or any of the Sub-treasuries or the customhouses. The provision which has just been read limiting the power of detail of men from the Secret Service was enacted by Congress some years ago in order to break up an abuse.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I know about that; but what I do not understand, I will say to the gentleman from Kentucky, is that here on page 36 is to be found an express authorization that the Secretary of the Treasury may employ or detail four persons paid from the appropriation for suppressing counterfeiting and other crimes and use them, as I understand it, in some other work, while on page 39 is to be found a provision that "any person who may be transferred from the Secret Service shall not be paid from any appropriation carried in this bill; and it seems to me the limitation on page 39 is inconsistent with the authorization on page 36, and, in fact, prohibits what is authorized in the other paragraph. The same language, I think, was in the last bill, but it seems to me it is not clear.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I am endeavoring to ascertain just the point the gentleman is trying to inquire about.

Mr. MONDELL. What is it?

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. It seems to me, I will say to the gentleman from Wyoming, that what is authorized on page 36, line 18, by the paragraph beginning on line 11, which specifically authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to use four persons who are paid from an appropriation for suppressing counterfeiting and other crimes, is prohibited by the paragraph on page 39, lines 13 to 18, inclusive.

Mr. SHERLEY. If the gentleman will permit, I suspect the distinction is found in this, that the provisions on page 39, lines 13 to 18, apply in cases where men are taken off the rolls of the Secret Service Division. A practice had come up of having these men transferred to other work altogether apart from the Secret Service work, while still being paid out of the appropriations for Secret Service purposes. Now, we prohibit that in the language contained between lines 13 and 18, page 39, and the other language to which the gentleman refers is not the case of having men taken off the rolls of the Secret Service, but is an express authorization for a detail of men in that service for special work in the Treasury Department.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. In any branch of the Treasury service?

Mr. SHERLEY. There was no trouble, apparently, in accounting under those two items.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to call the attention of the gentleman from Kentucky to the language of this item. Gentlemen will recall that there has been some change made in the language of the item and that certain words which occurred on page 69, at the bottom of the page, relative to the person of the President were stricken out. My notion is that in striking out certain words the paragraph has been left so that it is ambiguous or misleading. It starts out by providing:

For expenses incurred under the authority or with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury in detecting, arresting, and delivering into the custody of the United States marshal having jurisdiction dealers and pretended dealers in counterfeit money and persons engaged in counterfeiting Treasury notes, bonds, national-bank notes, and other securities of the United States and of foreign Governments, as well as the coins of the United States and of foreign Governments, and other felonies committed against the laws of the United States relating to the pay and bounty laws, hire and operation of motor-propelled or horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles when necessary, per diem in lieu of subsistence, when allowed pursuant to section 13 of the sundry civil appropriation act approved August 1, 1914, and for no other purpose whatever, except in the protection of the person of the President and of the person chosen to be President of the United States.

It seems to me that that is somewhat ambiguous. We have not made it entirely clear what it is that is proposed. It is possible in a hurried reading of the language that it is not clear to me when it is, in fact, clear.

Mr. SHERLEY. Oh, well, the distinction between the bill as it is reported and the language submitted to the committee is that the language submitted to the committee undertook to make permanent law the provision authorizing the protection of the President and of the person chosen to be President of the United States, and the committee did not consider it advisable to do that. The gentleman will recall that some years ago there was considerable discussion as to just what language should be used in order to properly embrace the case of the President elect, there being no law by which such a person was recognized as such until he is actually elected by the presidential electors President of the United States; and after considerable discussion it was thought that the language which we then adopted, and which we are now carrying, was sufficient for the practical results desired.

Mr. MONDELL. Well, I am not so sure after having read the paragraph again myself but what it is clear. I recall that discussion in the committee, and it agreed upon what is in the bill, but from a hurried reading I thought that it was somewhat ambiguous, but now I think it is all right. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

Mr. GILL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I ask unanimous consent to go back to page 36, line 6.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to recur to page 36 for the purpose of offering an amendment to line 6.

Mr. SHERLEY. Reserving the right to object, I would like to know what the gentleman's amendment is.

Mr. GILL. I do not want to offer an amendment, Mr. Chairman, but just want to speak to the paragraph.

Mr. SHERLEY. I suggest to the gentleman that he can speak under the pro forma amendment without referring back.

Mr. GILL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. Mr. Chairman, there is \$175,000 appropriated in this

bill for the purpose stated in this paragraph, and it brings to my mind the question as to whether it is advisable or not to appropriate that large sum of money for the cause specified. In our city this week the officials of the United States Government are taking over 20 men to the penitentiary. Those men have been convicted in the Federal courts of a violation of the oleomargarine law. Those indictments have been on the books for about five years under Republican rule and under Republican officials, and it occurs to me to ask at this time, when the Government needs money as badly as it does, how comes it that such companies manufacturing butter or oleomargarine, such as the Capital City Creamery, of Ohio, that has only been paying about a quarter of a cent a pound, has not been molested. Also the large company in Providence, R. I., that has not been molested.

In this court in St. Louis where these men were convicted the Federal judge exchanged positions with the judge in Kansas City. His son practiced in that court. His son accepts fees from men who are manufacturing oleomargarine. Another relative helped to put the prosecuting attorney in office, and not until the Democratic officials were put into those offices has there been any convictions—that is, to speak of; there were two, I believe, out of about 50 or 100 indictments. Now, does this thing exist all over this country? Oleomargarine is the poor man's food. He can not afford to buy the genuine butter. You pick up these little fellows and pull them before the bar of justice and send them to the penitentiary. In order to avoid a scene in our city at the Union Station the prisoners were taken around the city, so their fathers, mothers, wives, daughters, and children would not meet their relatives who were being taken to the Federal prison. Now, I ask, how is it that such things can happen in this country? I ask you how is it that large concerns, that would possibly bring a revenue to this Government of five or ten million dollars, are let go free?

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILL. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. Did I understand that under this Democratic administration small offenders, poor men who offend, are convicted, and rich men and corporations are not convicted, but allowed to flagrantly and notoriously violate the law and get off scot free? Is that the statement of the gentleman?

Mr. GILL. My point is this, that for 10 years the large creameries in Ohio and Providence, R. I., have only been paying a quarter of a cent a pound on tinted oleomargarine when, in justice, they should pay 10 cents per pound, and they have been let go free.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BORLAND. I ask unanimous consent that the time of my colleague be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that the time of his colleague [Mr. GILL] be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILL. Mr. Chairman, these things are heart-rending. They appeal to me. I can not understand them. That is the reason why I am actuated to rise and ask these questions.

In reply to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], I will say yes, that Democratic attorneys who have lately been put into office have had charge of these cases in St. Louis, and about 20 people in that neighborhood have gone to the penitentiary. Personally I believe it is wrong. I do not uphold violators of the law, but I can not see the crime.

Mr. SHERLEY. If the gentleman will permit, Congress has passed a law making it a crime to sell oleomargarine as butter, and there has been a great deal of such fraud uncovered. Some \$16,000,000 of frauds in connection with the oleomargarine business have been uncovered. Now, we have passed the law. The wisdom of the law is one thing, but its enforcement is another. We have a law which makes it a crime to undertake to sell oleomargarine of a certain character without paying a prescribed tax, and there have been repeated violations of that law, just as there are violations of the internal-revenue law in relation to distilled spirits. There has been commendable activity on the part of the Internal Revenue Department recently in unearthing these frauds, which activity has resulted not only in stopping a great many of them but in recovering considerable sums of money to the Treasury and in putting some gentlemen in the penitentiary who ought to be there.

Mr. GILL. And letting others go who deserve a great deal more to be there.

Mr. SHERLEY. I am sure if the gentleman has any information, or if any of his constituents have any information, of the violation of the oleomargarine laws anywhere the Department of Justice will be more than glad to obtain that information, and will immediately undertake an investigation and prosecution if the facts show that it is warranted.

Mr. GILL. I am only bringing out the fact that this thing exists all over the country. These indictments have been pending in our courts for the last five or six years.

Mr. SHERLEY. If the gentleman will permit me, I will tell him that to my knowledge there have been a number of indictments found in various parts of the country, in Illinois as well as Missouri. In the East quite a number of men have been indicted for violation of the internal-revenue laws touching oleomargarine. There are now out at work in various parts of the country a number of special agents of the Government who are giving their time to the investigation of these matters.

Mr. GILL. If we spend the sum of money mentioned in this bill, \$175,000, I believe the revenue officials ought to get mighty busy and bring to justice the large dealers.

Mr. SHERLEY. They have, and \$300,000 has been recovered for the benefit of the Treasury recently.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I can not believe that the Attorney General's office as now constituted, or as heretofore constituted, are to be criticized in connection with the prosecutions for the manufacture of oleomargarine contrary to law. I have no doubt whatever that they are doing the best they can, and it is quite likely that at St. Louis, where, as is suggested by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GILL], they have prosecuted some of the smaller people, it has been with a view of getting some confessions from those who have been convicted, so that it will be easy to obtain the information against those higher up. They followed a somewhat similar proceeding at Chicago and they have convicted some very big men and concerns.

I think the oleomargarine law would not be favored by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY], who is now in charge of this bill, or the gentleman from St. Louis [Mr. GILL], who just spoke, or myself. I think we are all opposed to legislation of that character. Probably the oleomargarine law is violated more often to-day, and has been for some years, than any other law on the statute books. It is harder to obtain the information. When you consider, however, the proposition that was voted for in this House a few days ago for prohibition, in the form presented, where it was made legal to manufacture liquor, but illegal to manufacture it for sale, and then when you contemplate the inability to enforce a law which forbids the coloring of oleomargarine without the payment of a tax, anybody with common sense ought to know that it would be impossible for the Government to enforce that constitutional amendment against the sale of liquor; and that instead of bringing about prohibition, it would bring about free liquor everywhere.

A few years ago, since I became a Member of this House, a man who had worked for me came to me one day and said that he had bought out an oleomargarine route, and he was going to sell butter. Well, the man was really an honest fellow. He did not mean to do wrong. I made some inquiries from him, and learned that his intention was to buy uncolored oleomargarine, to get the coloring matter either by purchase or gift from the same people who sold him the uncolored oleomargarine, to take the two products into his barn and make colored oleomargarine, and sell it as fresh dairy butter. Well, having some sense himself, he took good advice and did not continue the business. I said to him, "You will be caught just as sure as you are alive." He said, "Oh, no. There is no danger at all. It is being done all over Chicago and elsewhere. There are a great number of routes here now. Nobody is bothering them." I guess that was true at that time, but they were collecting the information. I do not know how many men were sent to the penitentiary for doing this sort of thing, but it was a very large number. Yet I do not suppose they got one-tenth of them.

Mr. FITZGERALD. You mean in Chicago?

Mr. MANN. That is the only place where they have had the nerve to go ahead and convict them. In New York they do it openly, and everybody winks at it. Nobody has had the nerve really to try to enforce the law there. In fact, all laws in New York are doubtful of enforcement, but in Chicago they are attempting to enforce the law. It is not an easy thing. A man buys uncolored oleomargarine and pays 9½ cents a pound, or such a matter; and then colors it and sells it as colored oleomargarine or colored butter. As long as that temptation exists, there will be lots of violations of law. And if, in addition to that, a man could make whisky in his basement or cellar, at a cost of not over 20 cents a gallon, and could sell it for \$1.50 or \$2 a gallon illicitly, how could you enforce the law?

The Clerk read as follows:

CUSTOMS SERVICE.

For collecting the revenue from customs, \$10,150,000. The provisions of the act of March 3, 1879 (20 Stats., p. 386), as amended by the act of April 27, 1904 (33 Stats., p. 396), authorizing the Secretary of

the Treasury to expend out of the appropriation for defraying the expenses of collecting the revenue from customs such amount as he may deem necessary, not exceeding \$150,000 per annum, for the detection and prevention of frauds upon the customs revenue, are further amended so as to increase the amount to \$200,000, to be so expended for the fiscal year 1916.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I had intended to look up these sections of the Revised Statutes, but neglected to. The paragraph has been carried in the appropriation bills heretofore, but this is the first time that the limitation has been inserted of expenses relating to the collection of revenue. What are sections 3749 and 3750 of the Revised Statutes?

Mr. SHERLEY. Section 3749 reads as follows:

The Solicitor of the Treasury is authorized, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, to rent, for a period not exceeding three years, or to sell, at public sale, any unproductive lands, or other property of the United States acquired under judicial process or otherwise in the collection of debts, after advertising the time, place, and conditions of such sale for three months preceding the same in some newspaper published in the vicinity thereof, in such manner and upon such terms as may, in his judgment, be most advantageous to the public interest.

Mr. MANN. This is where we acquire land on a judgment sale.

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes. Section 3750 is as follows:

The Solicitor of the Treasury shall have charge of all lands and other property which have been or may be assigned, set off, or conveyed to the United States in payment of debts, and of all trusts created for the use of the United States in payment of debts due them; and of the sale and disposal of lands assigned or set off to the United States in payment of debts, or vested in them by mortgage or other security for the payment of debts: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to real estate which has been or shall be assigned, set off, or conveyed to the United States, in payment of debts arising under the internal-revenue laws, nor to trusts created for the use of the United States, in payment of such debts due them.

Mr. MANN. Is the gentleman able to tell us how many pieces of land we have of that character which requires custody, care, protection, and so forth? Of course the appropriation is a very small one and has been carried from year to year.

Mr. SHERLEY. That was not brought out at the hearings, and I have not the information. This is simply the annual appropriation to take care of these cases as they may arise.

Mr. MANN. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I remember that we have heard something about insidious lobbies, also that we have heard something from some in high places about the pressure that is being exerted to prevent the passage of the pending shipping legislation. Of course we did not expect any effort from those in high authority to influence anyone to support that legislation. So I want to read a letter that I understand has been sent to all Democratic Members, and I think has been received this morning:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: May I ask you to read the first 20 pages, at least, of a report recently made to the Senate in response to a resolution of that body by the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Commerce on the shipping situation? If you have time to read the entire report, I think you will find it highly illuminating.

With warm regards, I am,
Faithfully, yours,

W. G. McAdoo.

As far as I know, that letter has not been received by any Republican. I have been wondering why, and I have come to the conclusion that it is because we do not need the information; in other words, we do not belong to the blind, misinformed, or ignorant described by the President in his Indianapolis speech.

As we have here a large expenditure given to the Secretary of the Treasury—some \$10,150,000—I was wondering whether the money expended for the purpose of sending out this letter could be said to be used in the collection of revenue.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. Here is a very large lump-sum appropriation, and I note that my genial friend from North Carolina [Mr. PAGE] is present now as he usually is. It is an appropriation of \$10,150,000—not statutory compensation in a good many places at least—

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is, practically, because under the reorganization it was provided for a few years ago, and the President issued an order fixing the organization and compensation of certain officials under the act, which applies to every other department except the Department of Agriculture, due to the activity of the gentleman from Illinois, among others, so that none of these salaries could be increased.

Mr. MANN. They may be; but they could be reduced.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The details of all the positions and the services and compensation to be expended out of this appropriation are stated.

Mr. MANN. Here is \$10,150,000 in a lump sum.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It used to be over \$11,000,000 in Republican administrations.

Mr. MANN. Yes; but there was then some revenue collected, and there would be if the Republicans were in office, which is more than can be stated now. Here we have the revenues falling off, partly because of the war but principally because of Democratic bad legislation.

Mr. FITZGERALD. You do not blame the Democratic Party for the war in Europe? The Republicans used to take credit for large fine crops, the sunshine, and the rain.

Mr. MANN. It is true that the Republicans took credit for the resources and fertility of the soil and for the sun that shone upon it and the rains that wet the soil, but we brought something out of it worth while. You can not take credit for these things because with all these things still remaining, you have brought the country to a condition of hard times which it never witnessed before. We took credit because we made use of God's benefactions; but you could not take credit, because you have not got sense enough to make use of them. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] However, that has nothing to do with this question.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The mere ukase of the gentleman from Illinois is not yet all persuasive in this country. I do not believe that he even persuades himself.

Mr. MANN. I do not have to persuade myself; I know it. The gentleman from New York tries to persuade himself, but he can not because he knows the same thing.

Mr. FITZGERALD. What I know I know; and the gentleman does not know he knows, but he imagines he knows. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. No; I do not know what I imagine I know. I know that under the Republican administrations we had prosperity in the land, and it is not necessary for me to say what the conditions are now under a Democratic administration, or what they were 20 years ago under a Democratic administration, except that some people know a great deal better than those Members who are here now drawing fat salaries.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. BORLAND. Oh, I thought the gentleman from Illinois had concluded.

Mr. MANN. I really wanted to get some information.

Mr. FITZGERALD. If that is all the gentleman desires, we can supply that.

Mr. MANN. Everybody knows these other things that I have said. I would like to know why it is that we can not have some kind of segregation of the \$10,000,000 for the collection of customs revenues.

Mr. FITZGERALD. We can.

Mr. MANN. Why should not we have it?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Every detail of that appropriation is at hand, what was expended in 1914 and what is proposed to be expended in 1916. Of course, the number of persons employed under this appropriation depends to some extent upon the volume of business to be done, and, with the European war, the imports to this country are not as great as they were before it commenced. Some of these persons, therefore, are not employed, but under the reorganization of the customs department the compensation of the great bulk of employees is fixed and permanent. It is merely a question of whether they shall be employed.

Mr. MANN. Oh, I am aware of the fact that this used to be a permanent appropriation, but then we appropriated an additional sum from the continuing appropriation. That is true enough; but that does not dispose of this matter. The gentleman says that we can go to the Book of Estimates and find out. That is true of all this bill. I wonder the gentleman did not bring in a bill providing that there is hereby appropriated, to be expended under the various departments of the Government by direction of the President, \$125,927,538.29, and then say if we wanted to know what this is for that we could go to the Book of Estimates.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Or ask me.

Mr. MANN. Or asked the gentleman from New York, but not successfully.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that his time be extended for five minutes, as I desire to ask a few questions of the gentleman from New York.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the gentleman from New York [Mr. Fitz-

GERALD] to the fact that only a few years ago, when I had something to do with the Indian appropriation bill, I remember he had a great deal to say about lump-sum appropriations. My recollection is that in that bill there was a lump-sum appropriation of something like \$150,000 or \$200,000, and the gentleman criticized it at great length, lectured the committee, and denounced generally the subject of lump-sum appropriations. I notice now, as he has advanced in the councils of this body, he brings in a bill that contains one lump-sum appropriation that is larger than the total amount carried in the Indian appropriation bill, amounting to over \$10,000,000.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman must admit that some progress has been made in this matter since I have been chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. Under the Revised Statutes, \$2,750,000 were appropriated every six months to defray the cost of collection of customs. That amounted to \$5,500,000 a year in a permanent appropriation. In addition, it was necessary for Congress to appropriate \$5,000,000 or \$5,500,000 additional to the permanent appropriation. After a number of years of effort, with the cooperation of other gentlemen, the permanent appropriation was repealed. The Customs Service was reorganized, a number of places was eliminated, and a provision enacted, under the leadership of the Committee on Appropriations, prohibiting the increasing of any of the compensations fixed in the order of reorganization. The entire Customs Service was placed on an entirely different basis.

The result of that legislation has been that for the next fiscal year and for the current fiscal year the customs service will cost \$850,000 less than it cost a year ago. That is a saving of about 8 per cent, and it is a very considerable item. It may be that by degrees the committee will segregate this item in a different manner. Thus far, however, we have made considerable progress in effecting a reform in this particular service, and if the gentleman can judge from the experience of the past, from what the committee has done in this respect, he may rest content in the assurance that as time goes on we will so arrange these appropriations as to make them perfectly satisfactory. This appropriation, however, is different from some that have been criticized. The great bulk of the payments out of this appropriation is for services, the compensation for which is fixed and can not be changed. The number of persons to be employed will depend very largely upon the volume of imports and whether the imports are at certain points or at other points. So with the information which is now obtained in connection with this appropriation in the estimates and from the information obtained since the enactment of the law requiring information of this character there has been made possible a control and scrutiny of these appropriations that heretofore have not existed.

Mr. Chairman, this appropriation could be segregated so as to provide for the payment of salaries of customs employees. They receive the great bulk of this appropriation. In 1914 \$9,255,868 were expended for that purpose. Special agents and employees of a similar character received \$261,000. The rents could be segregated, \$132,000 being expended for rent, contingent expenses about half a million dollars, and certain other miscellaneous items. The tentative pay roll of the customs service for 1916 is \$10,386,521.50, and yet it is expected by reason of vacancies that will not be filled, by suspension of people employed, by the nonnecessity to do certain services, to save approximately \$225,000, which will bring the expenditures within the limit of \$10,150,000.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. There have been many of these little submarine attacks from the Republican side of the House, as if this country were on the toboggan toward destruction, the gentleman in charge of them usually being the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY], whom I do not now see in the Chamber. He bobs in here every little while and reads some irrelevant matter into the RECORD, or makes an irrelevant speech, and immediately disappears from our legislative duties. Because of these attacks I want to call his attention to some facts he seems to have overlooked. A very recent issue of a metropolitan paper gives this synopsis of the statement of foreign trade balances of the United States, and I desire to call the attention of our Republican friends particularly to this, because they fear that we are not doing any business in this country:

HUGE TRADE BALANCES.

The world is buying from us at a rate and on terms to make us at the same time its merchant and its banker.

For last week the Government's foreign trade figures at 13 test ports showed a balance in favor of this country of more than \$26,000,000. From those test districts the Department of Commerce estimates the week's balance for the whole country at more than \$32,000,000.

For the first 19 business days of the new year the foreign trade balance shatters all previous records. The average daily balance has

been not less than \$6,500,000. This would give, up to last Saturday night, some \$120,000,000. For the whole month the balance may run nearer an average of \$7,000,000 a day.

Five Sundays and New Year's Day will leave for the whole month when it is closed 25 business days. The daily average of \$6,500,000 would give more than \$162,000,000 for all January; the average of \$7,000,000 would give some \$175,000,000!

In December there was a balance in our favor of nearly \$132,000,000. From the two months together we are assured of a trade balance—in scarcely more than fifty business days—well over \$300,000,000.

Only a few weeks ago, following the outbreak of the war, it was exactly \$300,000,000 against us on current balance, which made our position in the international credit market seem desperate. The supreme questions were whether there were any possible way to cancel that foreign balance against us with anything but gold, and whether, under the circumstances of fiscal demoralization the world over we could possibly spare that much gold to achieve the imperative liquidation.

We did begin to send gold. Our bankers did prepare to protect our international credit with a gold pool. But the foreign balance demanding settlement, we never canceled with gold; we never had to. We wiped it out with our exports of the farm and of the factory. We cleared it all up before the end of the old year.

And now we are beginning the new year with trade credits abroad for January between \$150,000,000 and \$175,000,000. We are lending credits everywhere. We are refusing to ask gold which we could demand. We don't want more gold; we do want business.

We are no longer concerning ourselves about—we are not even remembering—our debts of only the other day. We are marveling at the way in which the whole world is owing us at the rate of five, six, seven million dollars a day more, while we become the creditor nation of the world.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Missouri has called our attention to what a godsend the awful devastation in Europe has been to the Democratic Party.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, as usual the gentleman is unfortunately wrong.

Mr. MONDELL. We are selling cannon and cannon balls—

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman is mistaken. We are sending over food products.

Mr. MONDELL. Armor and submarines and armored automobiles and all sorts of things to spread that devastation abroad, and that fact has changed the disastrous trade balance that the legislation of the gentleman's party has brought upon us.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. MONDELL. I will.

Mr. BORLAND. That is a familiar answer, but does not the gentleman realize the fact that if large contracts had been placed in this country for munitions of war they could not have been finished possibly in December, and that this balance in January and December is not from that class of shipments at all?

Mr. MONDELL. Well, the exports that are not munitions of war are largely clothing and foodstuffs and those things that are required of us by reason of the war, and would not be required in such large quantities except for the war. Why, the gentleman himself admitted the situation. He called attention to the fact that before the war began our trade balances were shifting tremendously against us, the inevitable effect of the Underwood tariff law, large imports coming from abroad and little market abroad for our goods.

The war came on and changed the scene. One very curious fact of this situation is that, with these enormous exportations of goods of all classes and kinds, the President of the United States and the Secretary of the Treasury are trying to make the American people believe that we must spend thirty, forty, or fifty million dollars of the Government's money to buy ships to export goods in, right now when the balance of trade is running in our favor by the exportation of foodstuffs to an extent that is alarming the people of the country, raising the price of bread and wheat.

At a time when bills are before the committees of Congress proposing to prevent the export of numerous articles, when export is great on account of the foreign demand, the President is trying to make the people believe—aided and abetted by the Secretary of the Treasury and various other gentlemen—that we have not ships enough to carry our exports to foreign shores. If the balance of trade is so tremendously in our favor, as the gentleman has suggested, surely we are not needing more ships to carry our goods to foreign lands.

Mr. Chairman, I did not rise for the purpose of answering the gentleman's statement in regard to our foreign trade, but to make this observation in regard to this item. There is an old saying to the effect that there is no great loss without some small gain. Well, that is true in all times except under a Democratic administration. [Applause on the Republican side.] We have had an enormous loss in revenue through the customhouses. We ought to have some small gain in the cost of collecting revenues; and yet it develops in the hearings that it costs about as much to collect the little dribblings of revenues that we secure under Democratic tariff legislation—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. I ask that I may have three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MONDELL. As it does to collect the plentiful revenues that flow in through the customhouses under a Republican administration. It costs just as much to collect a small duty as it does to collect a large duty. There is a little saving when we place an article on the free list, but comparatively little. There has been a great reduction in the amount collected and the cost of collection in comparison with the revenue received is, of course, considerably increased. And so here is a great loss without any small gain. We not only lose in revenue, but we are compelled to pay practically the same amount for the collection of these diminished, uncertain, and unsatisfactory sums.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, going back to the opening of this discussion, which has wandered far afield, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] alluded to my statement a few days ago, when the Agricultural bill was under consideration, in reference to making lump-sum appropriations for compensation of personal services. I merely want to say to the gentleman from Illinois and to the committee that I do not sanction the lump-sum appropriation in this bill any more than I did in the Agricultural bill or any other appropriation that is made for the payment of personal services, but the statement made by me at that time, and made by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee a few minutes ago, does make a difference between lump-sum appropriations in any other appropriation bill than the Agricultural bill, for the reason that under a provision of law the salaries paid from these lump sums can not be increased. I think, as I said in the beginning, that this amount for the payment of the administration of the Customs Service should be segregated, and I hope that the time will very soon come when in the preparation of these bills they will be brought into the House, not only this item but all other items that are providing for the compensation of personal services, segregated so that not only the committee making up the appropriation bill but that the membership of the Congress may have information not only as to the amount that is paid for personal services, but the individual salaries and who receive them, and I will always lend my assistance to the gentleman from Illinois or any other gentleman looking toward that end.

I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I did not have the pleasure of hearing what the gentleman from Illinois nor the gentleman from New York, the chairman of this committee, had to say in reference to this lump-sum appropriation, and therefore I can not reply as did the gentleman from North Carolina who has just taken his seat. I surmise, however, that they criticized those of us who, when the Agricultural appropriation bill was up, took occasion to criticize a lump-sum appropriation and have failed to make a similar criticism of this paragraph of the pending measure.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Please do not accuse me of that.

Mr. COOPER. I did not make any accusation; it is nothing but a surmise.

Mr. MANN. I was criticizing this lump-sum appropriation.

Mr. COOPER. I should suppose that the gentleman would himself criticize it and probably criticize us for not criticizing it. The other day when the Agricultural bill was up I suggested that all of these lump-sum appropriations were based on detailed estimates sent in by the respective departments, and that there was not any valid reason then, nor is there any such reason now, why 98 per cent of appropriations in the bill can not cover specifically the detailed estimates sent up by the departments, excepting, of course, such estimates as the committee may decide to reject. Lump-sum appropriations prevent the man who pays the taxes from knowing how the public moneys are to be expended. When a \$50,000 lump-sum appropriation is made to cover a great number of estimates the official who expends that sum is not bound to spend it in accordance with the detailed estimates, but he spends it in his discretion.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. COOPER. Yes.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. So far as the amount of compensation paid from the lump sums in any other of these appropriation bills and the Agricultural bill is concerned, he can not do what the gentleman has said. He can not pay a compensation this year greater than the compensation paid for the same service last year by the same provision of law that applies to every appropriation bill except the Agricultural appropriation.

Mr. COOPER. There is not any reason why the law itself

should not set forth specifically the purposes for which an appropriation is made and the amount that can be expended in the accomplishment of those purposes. Such provisions ought to have been in the Agricultural bill, as they ought to be in every other bill.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin long enough to make a suggestion. I do not think that the gentleman from North Carolina and the gentleman from New York are correct when they assume that this lump-sum appropriation is proper because it can not advance salaries. The latter assumption is incorrect. It is true that under the law where you have a place under a designated title, which is peculiar, you can not advance the salary of that place. It is equally true that you can abolish a place and create another office with a different title and advance that salary, and that has not been infrequently done both by this administration and prior administrations. It is also true that under this arrangement now no one can tell how much money is being expended for different classes of work or how many people are being kept in office who ought not to be kept there because they have nothing to do. Now, I am not disposed to criticize the Committee on Appropriations for bringing in this lump-sum appropriation. It is true that only recently we repealed the law. There was a law that made an appropriation of—what was it, \$5,000,000 or \$5,500,000 permanent appropriation?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Five million dollars.

Mr. MANN. And that appropriation of \$5,500,000 was in the sundry civil bill. And where we did that it was not very easy to segregate the items, because one was a permanent appropriation and one was an annual appropriation, and it was not very practicable to tell out of which appropriations salaries, and so forth, were to be paid.

Now, I was a party to the conspiracy to repeal that permanent appropriation law. And one of the reasons it was repealed was that with the permanent appropriation law standing it was not practicable to segregate the item in the annual bill, and it was expected that when the permanent law was repealed and we would make an annual appropriation for the entire services of collecting the customs, we would segregate the items. I have no doubt the Committee on Appropriations, as soon as they could get the information from an unwilling Treasury Department—and whoever has control of it will always be unwilling—and can get the time to put it in shape, the committee will bring in items segregated at least to some degree, and know how many people are being paid as customs agents, how many are being paid for clerical work, in various other branches of the service. It is nonsense to say that we can segregate all the items in the District of Columbia in the departments down to charwomen and up to secretaries and the Cabinet and then can not make any segregation at all in the Customs Service, because we can.

Now, there is one other question I would like to ask the gentleman from New York apart from that. What is the name of the customs district that Washington is in?

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is numbered.

Mr. MANN. I know that; but what is it?

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is numbered now.

Mr. MANN. I know that; but what is it? What is the number of New York?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not know. I have no interest in it.

Mr. MANN. Now, this shows how absolutely silly we sometimes act on advice from some one. Last year we included in this law, the sundry civil bill:

Hereafter the collector of customs of each customs district shall be officially designated by the number of the district for which he is appointed and not by the name of the port where the headquarters are situated.

Now, I did know where the New York district was and where the Boston district and where the Georgetown district—which is this—was and where the Chicago district was, but there is nobody in the House that knows the name of the district that he lives in now, and even the gentleman from New York, living in the greatest collection district in the United States, if not in the world, does not happen to know and can not tell without reference to the books the number of the district in which he lives.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I have lost my number. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. The other day I was trying to make out an income-tax return, and among other things asked was, "In what district did you make a return last year?" Now, I know I made a return in the Chicago district, but I do not know what the number is.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That was the internal-revenue district.

Mr. MANN. I understand. They thought they would clarify the situation by putting in numbers as the names of districts,

and nobody can carry the numbers in his head. One knows where New York City is and one knows where New Orleans is, and one knows where all the large cities in the country are, or something about it, but there is nobody on earth who can carry the numbers of the different collection districts in his head. That is one silly, silly thing we did at the suggestion of the department last year.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, in the first place, the gentleman is mistaken when he thinks that it is not believed by members of the Committee on Appropriations desirable to segregate this item.

Mr. MANN. I do not say that the members of the Committee on Appropriations did not think it desirable to segregate the item.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I thought the gentleman said he did.

Mr. MANN. Oh, no. I said, on the contrary, I had no doubt that the committee would segregate the items as soon as they could reach them and get the information.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It would have been done in this bill were it not for the fact that at a short session like this there is not time to work out such changes. The committee were, I think, 42 days in taking the testimony on this bill.

Now, as to this question of the change from names to numbers of customs districts, it had a very good purpose, which has been served. I do not believe there is a Member of this House, except myself, who, even if he knew the number of his district, could tell its boundaries.

Mr. MANN. He would know where it was, anyhow.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I doubt whether the gentleman from Illinois could define the boundaries of the Chicago customs district.

Mr. MANN. But what difference does it make about the boundaries?

Mr. FITZGERALD. If you did not know the boundaries, how could you tell whether you were in the district or not?

Mr. MANN. You could tell whether you did business through the customhouse, even if you lost your number. I think the gentleman has lost his reason just now. [Laughter.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. I knew that the gentleman from Illinois would fall into that trap. How could he tell whether he was in a certain congressional district or not unless he knew the boundaries of the district? He might be elected from it, but that would not make much difference, except to be more or less a criterion of the intelligence of the people in the district.

But, as I say, the names of these districts were changed and numbers substituted for a very good reason. After the reorganization of the Customs Service some districts were abolished, the headquarters were located in certain cities, and the district took the name of the city in which the office of the collector was located. That aroused considerable jealousy and ill feeling in certain localities, where the people of a city of as much importance in population, resources, and commerce as the city in which the headquarters were located felt that their city was being discriminated against because it was not a port of entry, while people would imagine that the other city was a port of entry. When the reorganization took place it appeared that the headquarters had been located at certain places, but upon reconsideration it was found desirable to change the headquarters from one city to another. If a district had received the name of the city in which the headquarters of the district were, and then if the headquarters were changed to another city, to be compelled to change the name of the district to that of the new headquarters would start another riot among the people from whom the headquarters had been taken. So last year a provision was inserted conferring on the Treasury Department the power to transfer the headquarters from one place within the district to another and to eliminate this question of local jealousy and local pride and bombastic boasting because of the fact that the district was named after a particular community, by providing that the district should be numbered and known by number thereafter.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that his time be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Now, of course, I appreciate the grievance of the gentleman from Chicago. One of the things that made Chicago famous was the fact that it was known as the port of Chicago. Well, when that designation was abolished, and instead of being the port of Chicago it was collection district 23, the gentlemen can understand the indignation and vehement protests of the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Why, yes.

Mr. MANN. Is that the number of the Chicago district?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I have a list of the numbers here.

Mr. MANN. I never heard it before.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I was coming to that and was about to explain.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman can not understand, but I am not surprised at the asininity of any Democratic legislation.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The collection district having its headquarters at the city of New York is collection district No. 10. Now, I can imagine the sentiments of the gentleman from Illinois, in collection district No. 11, when he hears some of his constituents saying, "Come 'leven." That does not add to the fame and greatness and distinction of the city, but detracts from its glory, although it is characteristic of the prevalent form of amusement in that community. [Laughter.]

Now, of course, Mr. Chairman, all that would be very interesting if true, but the House understands that I have been speaking in a thoroughly facetious manner. Now, for the enlightenment of the gentleman from Illinois, so that there will be no misunderstanding, I shall place in the Record a list of the districts, with their numbers, notifying the gentleman from Illinois that the collection district with headquarters at Chicago is No. 39.

Mr. MANN. I am glad that the gentleman has finally discovered the number. He had two guesses before and missed it each time.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I said I was speaking in a thoroughly facetious manner.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman said that after he discovered that he was mistaken the two previous times.

Mr. FITZGERALD. If I had been serious, the remarks I made would have been directed to my genial friend from Philadelphia [Mr. MOORE], whose collection district bears the cabalistic number 11.

Mr. MOORE. I know the gentleman will yield.

Mr. FITZGERALD. But the statement I made would apply with equal propriety to either community. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MOORE. I hesitate to break in as between the two great cities of New York and Chicago, but has it not been a real pleasure to the gentleman from New York to know that the Federal Reserve Board has dovetailed the best part of New York with the Philadelphia district and thus added very much to the harmony of the occasion?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I notice that every time it has been desired to put some life into Philadelphia it has been done by amputating a portion of New York and attaching it to that slumbering town. [Laughter.] The same process was necessary in connection with the Federal reserve system.

Mr. MOORE. Has it not been a joy and a pleasure to the people of New York to know that they have made this pleasant attachment?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Well, I realize that it has not harmed New York any.

Mr. MOORE. It has done it a great deal of good.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I hope it will have the beneficial effect on Philadelphia that was intended.

With the consent of the House, I will put in the Record a copy of the Executive order which gives the numbers of the existing customs districts.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks as indicated. Without objection, that privilege will be granted.

There was no objection.

The document referred to is as follows:

DESIGNATION OF PRESENT CUSTOMS COLLECTION DISTRICTS BY NUMBERS.
TREASURY DEPARTMENT, September 4, 1914.

To collectors of customs and others concerned:

The following Executive order, dated the 27th of August, 1914, officially designating the present customs collection districts by numbers, is published for your information:

"Hereafter, under the provisions of the act of Congress approved August 1, 1914, making appropriations for the sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, the present customs collection districts are officially designated by numbers and will be known as follows:

"The district of Maine and New Hampshire to be district No. 1.

"The district of eastern Vermont to be district No. 2.

"The district of western Vermont to be district No. 3.

"The district of Massachusetts to be district No. 4.

"The district of Rhode Island to be district No. 5.

"The district of Connecticut to be district No. 6.

"The district of St. Lawrence to be district No. 7.

"The district of Rochester to be district No. 8.

"The district of Buffalo to be district No. 9.

"The district of New York to be district No. 10.

"The district of Philadelphia to be district No. 11.

"The district of Pittsburgh to be district No. 12.

"The district of Maryland to be district No. 13.
 "The district of Virginia to be district No. 14.
 "The district of North Carolina to be district No. 15.
 "The district of South Carolina to be district No. 16.
 "The district of Georgia to be district No. 17.
 "The district of Florida to be district No. 18.
 "The district of Mobile to be district No. 19.
 "The district of New Orleans to be district No. 20.
 "The district of Sabine to be district No. 21.
 "The district of Galveston to be district No. 22.
 "The district of Laredo to be district No. 23.
 "The district of El Paso to be district No. 24.
 "The district of Eagle Pass to be district No. 25.
 "The district of Arizona to be district No. 26.
 "The district of southern California to be district No. 27.
 "The district of San Francisco to be district No. 28.
 "The district of Oregon to be district No. 29.
 "The district of Washington to be district No. 30.
 "The district of Alaska to be district No. 31.
 "The district of Hawaii to be district No. 32.
 "The district of Montana and Idaho to be district No. 33.
 "The district of Dakota to be district No. 34.
 "The district of Minnesota to be district No. 35.
 "The district of Duluth and Superior to be district No. 36.
 "The district of Wisconsin to be district No. 37.
 "The district of Michigan to be district No. 38.
 "The district of Chicago to be district No. 39.
 "The district of Indiana to be district No. 40.
 "The district of Ohio to be district No. 41.
 "The district of Kentucky to be district No. 42.
 "The district of Tennessee to be district No. 43.
 "The district of Iowa to be district No. 44.
 "The district of St. Louis to be district No. 45.
 "The district of Omaha to be district No. 46.
 "The district of Colorado to be district No. 47.
 "The district of Utah and Nevada to be district No. 48.
 "The district of Porto Rico to be district No. 49."

WM. P. MALBURN, *Acting Secretary.*

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. Before we leave the Secretary of the Treasury, who is one of the most powerful of the Cabinet officers and who has to do with the collection of our revenues and who has recently manifested a great interest in the passage of the shipping bill, in which the President is also interested, I desire to say that during the last two days announcements have been coming from the Treasury Department in respect to an alleged congestion of commerce at various ports, the intimation being that there is so much commerce seeking export that the shipping bill desired by the administration should be speedily passed on pain that an extra session may be called.

Yesterday the announcement was made that the Secretary of the Treasury, who usually attends to his business and who does not go out on lecture tours, undertook to collect from the various collectors of the ports, reports of the congestion in the various districts.

And with remarkable spontaneity a number of the more loyal of the collectors indicated that there was very great congestion at their ports; that there was much commerce awaiting ships; that there was much grain awaiting vessels to carry it abroad; that there was much cotton on the wharves seeking an outlet to foreign countries.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. Was the gentleman present a few moments ago when the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] informed us about the enormous and unprecedented shipments of cotton abroad of late?

Mr. MOORE. I did not happen to be present.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman enlightened us as to the most unprecedented movement of cotton abroad.

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman has probably been reading the reports that come from the administration.

Mr. MONDELL. But the gentleman was telling us of the enormous shipments of cotton abroad.

Mr. BORLAND. I was reading from the report of a Cabinet officer.

Mr. MOORE. Then, the gentleman was giving the information that he got from the administration, and he is to be commended for his fairness in stating that fact openly and broadly to the House.

This morning the Secretary of the Treasury renews his crusade in favor of the shipping bill, and continues to get reports from his subordinates at various ports. Here is a report from the Philadelphia Record, a good Democratic newspaper, this morning:

FREIGHT CONGESTED HERE—OTHER PORTS TO SOUTH TAXED TO LIMIT BECAUSE OF LACK OF SHIPS.

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 8.

Supplemental reports on the shipping situation announced to-night by Secretary McAdoo showed serious freight congestion at Philadelphia, Mobile, and New Orleans, but practically normal conditions at Savannah, Charleston, Jacksonville, Key West, and Tampa.

Collector Berry's telegram was as follows:

"Investigation shows congestion in merchandise intended for export to foreign ports. Grain elevators all full. Unusual amount of export merchandise on piers. Exporters claim shortage in tonnage. Can not secure space for English ports until latter part February or

first of March. Later for large lots. Space for Glasgow can be had this month; Netherlands ports, no space until May; Scandinavian and Mediterranean ports, no space until March or April. No congestion in coastwise merchandise."

The collector at Galveston reported that, without docks at Bolivar and Texas City, his port "would be congested to the limit." The Tampa collector stated that exports at Pensacola would be doubled if neutral ships were available.

In order to find out what the situation really is I wired several friends in Philadelphia who have a fund of information, and from one of them, the secretary of the commissioners of navigation, I have received this telegram, which would not seem to confirm the statement of the Secretary of the Treasury that there is such congestion as would now warrant the passage of the shipping bill, or that in these times of business depression and deficit in the Treasury we should spend \$30,000,000 to buy foreign ships made by foreign labor to carry cotton and grain to foreign countries.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Suppose they should pass the shipping bill of which we hear so much talk, has the gentleman any assurance that one of these lines would run out of Philadelphia?

Mr. MOORE. Not at all; we have the opinion, as it came to us through the agricultural bill, that the administration would like to limit all commerce to three ports, in violation of the Constitution of the United States, so often and so ably defended by my friend from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson] and my other friend from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT].

Mr. MADDEN. What ports were they?

Mr. MOORE. One, if I recollect right, was San Francisco, one was New York, and the other Boston. The Gulf ports were entirely cut out, and all other Atlantic ports except Boston and New York. Only these ports, which can take the deep-draft vessels of the great Shipping Trust that is so talked about in this House, were considered.

[The time of Mr. Moore having expired, by unanimous consent he was given five minutes more.]

Mr. MOORE. In view of the agitation of this question by the Secretary of the Treasury hastening the passage of the shipping bill, which will necessitate our putting our hands in the people's pockets and taking \$30,000,000 more of their money to enter into a scheme of Government ownership, I have this telegram by way of reply:

PHILADELPHIA, February 9, 1915.

HON. J. HAMPTON MOORE, M. C.,

Washington, D. C.:

Philadelphia shipping men deny any unusual congestion in merchandise for foreign export. Only temporary trouble here, due to upsetting of regular sailing schedules by reason of congested situation in European ports, which has handicapped rapid discharging and loading there, and delay of ships by bad weather. Admit regular line services to foreign ports practically filled for February, but open for bookings for March and later sailings. Plenty of full cargo tramp steamships offering for business. There is free movement of full cargo grain steamships under past contracts, with no congestion of berths. The excess grain on track beyond elevator capacities will soon be relieved by boats here and due. Great improvement reported in condition of congestion at London and Liverpool, which in turn will clarify situation here.

GEO. F. SPOULE,

Secretary Commissioners of Navigation.

That statement alone would seem to indicate that the Secretary of the Treasury is gathering information which is misleading, and he is putting out statements which are not borne out by the facts. There is a temporary congestion at some of the ports, but it is not such a congestion as will warrant this Congress in following the administration in its desire, at this time of all times, to take \$30,000,000 out of the Public Treasury, with which to buy foreign ships made by foreign labor and manned by low-priced seamen, to compete with American vessels and to break up the shipyards in the United States, which thus far have been able to give decent and respectable employment to American labor.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. Certainly.

Mr. TOWNER. Is it not also stated in the morning paper that, on an average, grain ships are required to wait in European ports for 30 days before they can be assured of unloading their cargo?

Mr. MOORE. I have not seen that particular statement, but it is true that the ships are held up on the other side owing to conditions which I hope to describe in a moment.

Mr. TOWNER. Then, it would be useless for us to send more ships from this side at the present time, would it not?

Mr. MOORE. It would simply be clogging the conditions over there and making them worse than ever.

Mr. MADDEN. But nobody thinks that we are going to send them, surely.

Mr. MOORE. If it was not for the speculation in grain, cotton, and war munitions, I question whether there would be any

talk about additional ships at all. But the men who are making money by reason of the distress of European nations are the men who in this emergency desire ships built and provided for them at the expense of the Government. They want to make money at the expense of the poor devils whose blood and lives are being wasted on the other side, and at the expense of the American taxpayer who will have to pay the bill. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Another gentleman who is very well posted on this question, one of the very best maritime men I know, has sent me this statement:

Secretary McAdoo's reports of New York, Baltimore, and Norfolk collectors as to cause of congestion of ocean traffic inaccurate and misleading. Baltimore and New York are shipping grain to capacity of their terminal facilities. Unprecedented and unnatural accumulation of cotton at Norfolk is consequent upon conditions not associated with scarcity of vessels. They report 85,500 bales of cotton; total exports from Norfolk for fiscal year 1913 was 72,500 bales and for 1912, 21,300 bales.

FRANK L. NEALL.

So that those who are complaining about the lack of ability to get cotton out of the country ought to look at these figures. All they sent out in 1912 from Norfolk was 21,300 bales. All they sent out in 1913 was 72,500 bales, and thus far in this year they have sent out 85,500 bales.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman be extended for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I hope the committee will not start to participate in this perpetual performance at the other end of the Capitol on this shipping bill.

Mr. MOORE. If the gentleman will not object this time, I shall not raise any question hereafter as to the 15 minutes that the gentleman took a moment ago in which to explain a lump-sum item about automobiles for Cabinet officers.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will not object.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair hears no objection, and the gentleman is recognized for five minutes more.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the gentleman if he noticed the figures for the shipment of cotton for January? For each week during the month of January the figures show that the shipment of cotton was above normal.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I am glad the gentleman has that in mind, because I am going to put something in the RECORD as to that. My correspondent, Mr. Frank L. Neall, from whom I had the wire which I just read, gives me this additional information:

PHILADELPHIA, February 8, 1915.

Hon. J. HAMPTON MOORE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MOORE: * * * New York: Exports of grain from New York in January, 1915, were 8,500,000 bushels, which is at the rate of 102,000,000 bushels per annum. At no date since 1898 has New York exported 100,000,000 bushels or over in a single year. In 1912 New York exported 49,000,000 bushels; 1913, 60,000,000 bushels; 1914, 57,000,000 bushels.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. I am trying to give some New York statistics, but I yield.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Where did the gentleman get these statistics?

Mr. MOORE. From Mr. Frank L. Neall, a statistician, and one of the best-posted maritime experts in this country.

Mr. FITZGERALD. What does he do for a living?

Mr. MOORE. He is a shipping man.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Belonging in New York?

Mr. MOORE. No; to Philadelphia, which is far superior to New York.

Mr. FITZGERALD. And he is furnishing this information about New York conditions?

Mr. MOORE. He is.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Good night!

Mr. MOORE. It is necessary for us to go out of New York once in a while to find out what they are doing in New York.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I want to add this, that I know Mr. Neall, and he is a shipping expert known throughout the country. He was sent to Europe for the purpose of investigating the shipping question.

Mr. MOORE. He is one of the best-posted men in the shipping business in the United States. He has the figures and the statistics. He states that in January last, while this alleged

congestion was on, they shipped from New York 18,500,000 bushels of wheat, which is at the rate of 102,000,000 bushels of wheat per annum. Then he continues:

Large amounts of grain are held in New York on speculation and also for foreign account, later to be shipped out periodically, as may be directed by foreign Governments and owners.

You see, it is a mere matter of business, even with the speculators. Yet the Secretary of the Treasury is collecting these port statistics to show that because a lot of grain is waiting to be shipped in a normal way from New York that therefore we ought to buy \$30,000,000 worth of foreign ships. That is the reason this information is important and ought to be instructive to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Neall adds:

The congestion at New York is largely owing to overtaxing of the trunk-line grain elevators, the intermediary between the railroads and the ocean craft. As a consequence, the trunk-line railroad grain elevators are unable to handle the traffic tendered them.

Baltimore: During month of January, 1915, Baltimore exported 9,160,000 bushels of grain, and the newspapers list vessels coming for cargoes that were so numerous that the supply of pilots was exhausted, and as many as three vessels were brought up tandem by one pilot. Baltimore for months has been, and is at the moment, what is called "a capacity port." In other words, she has shipped to the full ability of her trunk-line grain elevators to handle the grain from elevators into ocean-going craft, of which there has been uninterruptedly a large surplus of tonnage waiting to load their cargoes of grain.

Baltimore has done everything—has furnished all of the ships that the railroads could fill.

As to the Norfolk situation, Mr. Neall is also well informed. He concludes his letter as to Norfolk as follows:

Norfolk: Collector reports in warehouses, under sheds, etc., at Norfolk, 85,586 bales of cotton, valued in Germany at \$5,476,000. The exports of cotton from Norfolk for fiscal years as stated are as follows:

	Bales.
1910-----	6,757
1911-----	15,835
1912-----	21,300
1913-----	72,544
1914-----	136,380

The one cry from the South for months past has been to get cotton to the seaboard, either for export or coastwise movement. In like manner, foreign buyers have invested in cotton so as to control and eventually ship out to provide for their monthly requirements. Norfolk is not now recognized as a port of grain export, and only exported 600,000 bushels in 1914, the last of which was shipped in March. Newport News exported in 1914, 3,297,000 bushels of grain, and during January, 1915, 800,000 bushels of grain.

Yours, truly,

FRANK L. NEALL.

It will be seen that this Norfolk cotton is valued in Germany at \$5,476,000. Somebody is interested in getting it over there. It is all for the purpose of getting the money. The grain is waiting to go in the usual way, but somebody wants to sell it quickly; they want to get the money and they can not get the money without the ships. It is money, money, money. They want ships paid for by the United States Government to get the money, and for whom? For the people in the United States who are speculators in grain and speculators in cotton. Is it for the cotton planter of the South or for the man who sows the wheat out yonder on the plains of Nebraska and Kansas? It does not seem so.

I have not time to give all of the statistics I have here, but I repeat that we are confronted with an abnormal pressure to pass a shipping bill because of the people who have grain and cotton stored up and who want to get the money for it by making the people buy the ships to secure it for them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOORE. I ask for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MOORE. And I will ask leave to extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MOORE. Referring further to the propaganda of the Secretary of the Treasury and in further explanation of my rising to criticize the reports that are being sent out as to the congestion of commerce to induce Members to vote for the administration bill to buy foreign ships, made by foreign labor and to be manned by foreign seamen, I quote from this report given out from Washington yesterday and published in the New York Sun. It refers to the actual conditions in London and Liverpool at this time:

CONGESTION RELIEVED—CONDITIONS AT PORT OF LONDON GREATLY IMPROVED.

WASHINGTON, February 6.

The British ambassador received to-day the following notice from the London Government:

"You may make public the fact that congestion at and in port of London has now greatly abated; only a very few ships are now at Gravesend awaiting berth, and delays to which vessels have formerly been subjected need no longer be expected. Labor is sufficient for necessities of the port."

"At Liverpool delays are less than they were, and they will be further reduced owing to arrangements being made by a committee representing the principal port authorities of Great Britain."

There is an answer to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER]. There has been congestion at London and Liverpool, but it is clearing up. The Secretary of the Treasury is urging the purchase of foreign ships, in spite of a temporary congestion that will soon be over. The people will have to pay the piper.

Go on gathering your information if you want to do so, Mr. Secretary of the Treasury; go on and pick it up from political sources everywhere along the coast line; go on pretending you are doing it in the interest of the grower of grain and the planter of cotton; but bear in mind that when you spend \$30,000,000 to buy foreign ships and displace American labor in American shipyards you are running up against a condition of congestion that does not warrant so serious a departure.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. I will.

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman that the growers of grain are not complaining. According to the statement of the Secretary of the Treasury, December, 1914, they sent abroad corn, wheat, and barley to the extent of 40,900,000 bushels.

Mr. MOORE. And it was not being held up.

Mr. GOOD. Whereas for the same month 1913 we only sent abroad 5,900,000 bushels.

Mr. MOORE. Was there any difficulty in sending it?

Mr. GOOD. Not at all.

Mr. MOORE. I am thankful the gentleman interrupted me. It is good to be confirmed by so eminent an authority. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

The unexpended balance of the appropriation made by the sundry civil act for the fiscal year 1915 for the necessary expenses and salaries of the customs service at the Panama-Pacific International Exposition, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, is continued and made available for the fiscal year 1916.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. This is to reappropriate money appropriated last year for the customhouse at the Panama-Pacific Exposition to be held at San Francisco. That exposition, I believe, opens the last day of this month or the 1st day of next month.

Mr. KETTNER and Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND. The 20th of February.

Mr. MANN. Then I am a little slow, as usual. It is a great exposition. I would like to inquire whether anybody on this side of the House or the other side knows what, if anything, is necessary to be done or is thought of being done in reference to official representation of the United States or Congress at that exposition or at the opening of the Panama Canal this year, if we reach it this year. The Panama Canal was to have been opened, I believe, formally on the 12th or the 13th of March. There was a discussion some time ago in reference to what would be done. I was called to the White House, I think early in January, and I heard some little discussion of the subject from the President, but I have not heard of anything since being done in the House or the Senate on the subject. Is it the intention to have the opening of the Panama Canal formally this summer? If so, is it the intention of having any representation of the executive departments or the legislative branch of the Government? Is it the intention to invite to that formal opening ex-President Roosevelt and ex-President Taft, who had so much to do with the provisions that resulted in the Panama Canal being constructed? Is it the intention to have any representation of the executive branch of the Government or the legislative branch of the Government at the Panama-Pacific Exposition in San Francisco? I think at all the other expositions—that is my recollection—of any size there have been some committees appointed to go there. That was the case, I believe, at Portland; that was the case at St. Louis; and it was the case at Jamestown. I do not remember whether it was at Buffalo; I believe it was in the case of Chicago, and it was at Omaha and Seattle. Now, is it the desire for economy or a proof of incompetency that nothing yet has been done in reference to either one of those propositions?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Does the gentleman ask that question of me?

Mr. MANN. No; I was trying to get a rise out of somebody who had information. [Laughter.] I knew if the gentleman from New York had information he would freely give it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I really did not know whether the gentleman was asking me or asking himself. He put the questions and turned to take his seat, and I thought perhaps he was talking to himself.

Mr. MADDEN. What did the gentleman finally conclude?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Well, I have not reached that point yet. I thought the gentleman was talking to himself. My recollection is that a short time ago the gentleman from Illinois, a few others, and myself were honored with an invitation to participate at a conference at which the plans were to be discussed as to what was to be done in connection with the opening of the Panama Canal. Unfortunately I had to leave the city. I supposed the gentleman from Illinois was in a position to furnish that information as to the result of that conference. I understand that a proposition was made tentatively to appropriate \$250,000 to defray the expenses of the ceremonies connected with the opening of the Panama Canal. In a more or less indirect and circuitous manner the information reached me that the program contemplated a charter of two or three or more vessels upon which to embark, like the animals in Noah's Ark, all the Members of Congress and take them down to the canal for the ceremonies. I could not think of anything in sacred or profane history that would picture the procession more than that old song of—

The animals went in one by one.
One more river to cross.
Says the ant to the elephant—

The gentleman from Illinois to the gentleman from Kansas—

Who are you pushing?
One more river to cross.

[Laughter.]

And I venture to suggest that I would just as soon be incarcerated in St. Elizabeth's as to be a member of any such procession or party. I think that 430 Members of the House and 96 Senators, however much they might add to the dignity and glory of any occasion, would not be such an attractive sight, after having been carried from the United States to Panama and lined up for the edification of such members of foreign Governments as might be there present, as would the men who built the canal.

What a spectacle for the gods! And so I ventured the suggestion that the canal could be very properly and appropriately opened, and the opening perpetuated and sent down the avenues of fame, with at least a less numerical representation from Congress. That impression grew on me when I found out it was estimated to spend about \$100,000 to take the really valuable part of the Government of the United States on this extra hazardous trip on the high seas to the vicinity of the Spanish Main. If the Panama Canal is to be opened in a formal manner with representatives of the Government, I am of the opinion that a suitable representation from the two Houses of Congress would be appropriate in connection with those exercises. But if they took over 500 Members of Congress down there and landed them on the Isthmus, and kept them aboard of the boats—because there would be no place to put them on the Isthmus—some genius in the future, writing about that trip, would be tempted to recall the description given of Congressmen in Washington by one of my late colleagues. He had been in politics for a great many years, and was finally elected to the House of Representatives. After being here a short time he returned, and some one asked him what he thought of Congress and Washington. He said, "Well, when I was an alderman I would visit the city departments in New York and be received with respectful consideration. Later in life I was elected a member of the assembly in the State of New York and found a little keener regard for my official position in the city, while it was possible for me to enter some of the State departments. Later than that I was elected to the State senate, and I found out that the fact that I was a State senator was an open sesame in every department in Albany and the city of New York. Then I was elected to the House of Representatives. Why, they tie horses to Congressmen in Washington on Pennsylvania Avenue." [Laughter.]

Any historian describing this horde of Members of the House and Senate landed on the Isthmus of Panama for the formal opening, with the President and the Cabinet, and the other distinguished officials of the Government, and the representatives of foreign Governments, and the Army officers and the Navy officers, would tell of their hanging their clothes on the Members of Congress. [Laughter.] That is about all the use they would be.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I saw a statement the other day that the formal opening of the canal was likely to be postponed until July. It has been contemplated to hold it in March. I

saw a statement that Col. Goethals was somewhat fearful that because of the Gold Hill slide it might be difficult to take the war vessels through the canal to the Pacific. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] and myself, on our visit to the canal in November, saw the condition of the Culebra cut. I do not believe there is any occasion for serious worry; but I can understand the conviction of the men in charge of the work that it would be much better that they be permitted to concentrate their efforts uninterruptedly on removing material from the cut coming in as the result of these slides rather than be put to the necessity of passing a large number of war vessels through under existing conditions. As to whether Congress intends to have official representation at the opening of the canal or at the exposition, I do not know.

In the sundry civil appropriation act of the current year, believing that perhaps Congress might be overlooked in the hurry of making the arrangements, the Committee on Appropriations made provision in one of the items of appropriation for the expenses of any representation from the two Houses on that occasion. Somebody has told me, in an informal manner, that they have spent all of that appropriation, and that that probably would not be available. What is proposed to be done at the opening of the exposition or as to the representation at the exposition, I do not know. This appropriation, however, is to provide for certain customs services. We have there now on the exposition grounds a force charged with the customs work. Exhibits are arriving continually. The customs officials at San Francisco originally estimated that \$500,000 would be required to pay for all the services in connection with that office. The Treasury Department recommended that \$250,000 be appropriated and the Committee on Appropriations came to the conclusion that \$200,000 would be ample. The information furnished to the committee this year is to the effect that it is expected that the entire cost of that service will be \$165,000, again vindicating the discriminating care with which the Committee on Appropriations lowers the amounts requested by the various departments of the Government. I have always been convinced that, while the committee has been charged with being niggardly and curtailing the expenditures in an unjustifiable manner, that to those who know the facts and truth of the circumstances, the committee is unjustifiably generous in ninety-nine times out of one hundred. It is also a pleasure to revert to incidents such as this to demonstrate my own opinion. The original estimate was \$500,000; the appropriation was \$200,000, and now the statement is made that the work will be done for \$165,000, and it only makes me regret that when we had the opportunity we did not give an appropriation of \$150,000. I am convinced it would have been just as easy to have this work done for \$150,000 or a little more than for \$165,000.

Now, having answered fully, completely, and categorically every question propounded by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], there is nothing more to be said.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I think there is a little more left to be said. I might ask a new question. Having failed to obtain any information from the gentleman from New York in reply to my question—

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman from Illinois should pay attention to the remarks of others than himself.

Mr. MANN. Well, in that respect I am different from the gentleman from New York. I do. The gentleman from New York always wants to be making remarks himself, as has been evidenced now. I sat quietly while the gentleman talked about 15 minutes. The gentleman interrupted me before I had had the floor for a quarter of a minute in order to make my speech for me. That is characteristic of my friend.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That shows the keen appreciation I have of the fact that my speech is so much better than the gentleman's.

Mr. MANN. There is something in that. I admit it. The gentleman from New York failed to give us any information upon this subject because he did not have it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. On which subject?

Mr. MANN. Oh, well, I will yield again if the gentleman wants to make another speech.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman asked a number of questions. Which one did I not answer?

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman wants to make another speech, I will yield. In other words, I want to make my own speech—without meaning any discourtesy, of course.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I thought the gentleman wanted to ask me a question. Otherwise I would not have bothered.

Mr. MANN. I suspected that the gentleman himself did not have the information, therefore I did not direct my first inquiry to him.

It was suggested some time ago, as stated by the gentleman from New York, that the President have a conference with a

few Members of the House. I was one of those invited, although the people who ought to have been invited were not. The people who had jurisdiction of the subject were not asked, though, of course, that was purely an inadvertence on the part of the President, or whoever got up the interview. At that time there were some suggestions made, on a report from the Secretary of War, as to attendance upon the opening of the Panama Canal. I supposed that had all been abandoned. It was suggested by some one—these suggestions were not made by the President himself—and the suggestion was laid before this little conference, that about 250 people be taken down on account of Congress at the expense of the Government. I very naturally, and I think correctly, said that that number was either too many or too few. Assuming that there are 500 Members of the two Houses of Congress, and that each one has some one to accompany him on a trip of this sort, 250 out of 1,000 are either too few or too many for anything but a junketing trip. I said to the President that I did not think there was any possibility of the House voting a junketing trip for itself at the same time that it was trying to reduce its allowance for mileage.

It did not seem quite possible to me that the House would vote to cut off the compensation now allotted for mileage and then double the amount and take it out in a trip to Panama. And the trip, so far as the Members of Congress were concerned, was to end at Panama. While this suggestion contemplated that the Cabinet be taken to Panama at Government expense, and then taken around to San Francisco and brought home, the representation from the legislative branch of the Government was to sail down to Panama, and then in two or three days start back. As far as I am concerned, I have made that trip several times, and am not anxious to make it again. But I wondered what had become of the proposition. Only a week or so ago, or perhaps a little longer than that, I received a hurry-up letter from the Secretary of State, urging that something be done, and inclosing a copy of a letter which he had written to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House—which committee, by the way, has nothing to do with the subject—and I replied to the Secretary of State, expressing the desire of this side of the House to cooperate in making any proper provision for the opening of the canal. Now, my understanding is that a suggestion was gotten up by a clerk somewhere and submitted to the President, and that when the President very properly asked some one in the House to introduce it he has been unable so far to find anybody in the House who would father the proposition.

But something ought to be done if it is ever to be done. The President ought to be present at the formal opening of the canal. Some of the executive departments ought to be represented there. I think it quite fitting that the Secretary of State, the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of the Navy be there. It would be quite fitting that there be a small committee from the House and the Senate to go there. It is certainly fitting that the two ex-Presidents be invited and possibly some others. The matter really ought to have been taken care of last summer, but it has not been taken care of yet, and I suppose that the canal will open up and pass vessels through it if we postpone the formal opening until they cut away Gold Hill and Contractors Hill, on the other side of the canal, and Culebra Hill, all of which have a tendency to slide into the canal. But what is going to be done? Does anybody know? Within the last four weeks of the end of this session, with the constant talk that there has been about the opening of the canal and representation at the exposition, does anyone know? Is it possible that in the House and the Senate they are again waiting for the orders of the captain of the team? Is there no originality on the part of Members of the House or the Senate? Can you not do anything until you get your orders? [Applause and laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The gentleman need not be worried. He may yet go on this trip. The urgent deficiency bill only has become a law. There is ample time to make provision.

In all seriousness, I agree with the gentleman from Illinois that Congress ought to provide the means to enable the Government to be represented in a fitting manner at the formal opening of the canal, if there is to be such a formal opening; and that not only should this Government be represented, but foreign Governments should be represented as the guests of the Government of the United States. I think that before the session ends, or, if its work is not completed when it does end, then before the next session ends ample provision will be made for the legitimate expenses connected with the formal opening of the canal. It is undoubtedly one of the most remarkable achievements to the credit of any civilized nation, and it should be appropriately commemorated. But in arranging for its commemoration the plans should be along such lines as will

commend them to the common sense and patriotism of the people of the United States. [Applause.]

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman said a moment ago that he thought this would be attended to at this session or the next session. Does the "next session" mean the session which ordinarily would begin on the first Monday in December?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; I said in the event that Congress does not complete its work at this session, if for any untoward circumstances it should be necessary to convene in extra session in order to enact the appropriation bills, why, under those circumstances—let no one think that I would hanker after an extra session.

Mr. COOPER. Oh, no.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I have enough trouble and hard work in the regular session to satisfy even an unreasonable man, without looking for a repetition of the same conditions unnecessarily.

Mr. COOPER. Of course, the gentleman does not hanker, nor does anyone else hanker, for an extra session; but the gentleman said it would be attended to at this session or the next. Now, regularly the next session would not begin until the first Monday of next December.

Mr. FITZGERALD. But irregularly it may.

Mr. COOPER. So that if the gentleman means an extra session he ought to let us have warning now.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I am not in a position to speak about the prospects for an extra session. I do not try to anticipate the future. I am perfectly content if I can do those things that I am expected to do as a Member of this House, with the hope and the implicit confidence that things will always be for the best and for the speedy termination of our labors otherwise than by retirement. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Scales for customs service: The unexpended balances of the appropriations heretofore made for construction and installation of special automatic and recording scales for weighing merchandise, etc., in connection with imports at the various ports of entry under direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, are continued and made available for expenditure during the fiscal year 1916.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] during the afternoon has announced a great increase in export trade for December and January, and this has been heralded as an indication of a general revival of business in the United States. No one has been discovered sufficiently optimistic to prophesy anything other than a deficit in the national finances during the coming fiscal year. The gentleman from New York, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, who is probably as well informed as anybody on this subject, very frankly stated during the debate on this bill that in his judgment there would be an inevitable deficit during the coming fiscal year variously estimated from \$20,000,000 to \$100,000,000.

The prevalence of the horrible war in Europe is proving a great political asset for the Democratic Party. The exports which are abnormal by reason of the large demands for American munitions of war and American foodstuffs give an opportunity to claim a great revival of trade. The war in Europe has been capitalized as an excuse for giving us a war tax in time of peace, and I have wondered if the present war in Europe should suddenly terminate whether the perpetual conflict which can always be depended upon over the Mexican border would be a sufficient political asset to justify the continuation of the war tax in the United States indefinitely.

But before we leave this part of the bill which has to do with the collection of the customs revenue I would like to ask the gentleman from New York whether the requirements of what is known as the Smith amendment have been observed by the administration—which requires the Executive and Secretary of the Treasury, when estimates are sent to Congress and it is discovered that the anticipated expenditures are in excess of the anticipated revenues, to make recommendations as to how the estimates may be reduced?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I did not quite catch the gentleman's question.

Mr. MARTIN. Whether the requirements of the Smith amendment as to an agreement between the anticipated expenses of the Government and the anticipated revenues are being observed by the Executive and the Secretary of the Treasury in their information to Congress upon financial legislation.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I imagine so. The Smith amendment provided that whenever the estimates for expenditures for the ensuing fiscal year were in excess of the estimated revenues

the Secretary of the Treasury should transmit a statement of the estimated receipts or revenues and the estimated expenditures to the President, and the President should transmit them to Congress, informing them or advising them as to how the estimates could be best reduced without impairing the public service, or, in the event in his opinion that they could not be reduced, of methods to be resorted to in order to obtain additional revenue necessary to meet the proposed expenditures.

Mr. MARTIN. Has any information of that sort been supplied to Congress during the present administration?

Mr. FITZGERALD. When the estimates of expenditures were transmitted to Congress at the beginning of the session my recollection is, from an examination of the report of the Secretary of the Treasury, that it showed an apparent surplus in the next fiscal year.

I might suggest to the gentleman that a very bad example was set by the Taft administration during which the law was enacted. One year the estimated expenditures, as transmitted to Congress, would have been far in excess of the estimated revenues, and so the estimated expenditures were ruthlessly cut down to bring them within the estimated revenues. That was discovered in a peculiar way. The law requires that the estimates be transmitted in the regular Book of Estimates and prohibits the transmittal of supplemental estimates except for service or services that have been authorized by legislation subsequent to the transmission of the estimates, or because of the happening of some extraordinary event that could not have been anticipated when the estimates were transmitted. Whenever supplemental estimates are transmitted the law requires these estimates to be accompanied by a detailed statement of the reasons why they were not transmitted in the regular Book of Estimates.

Secretary of the Navy Meyer, in a supplemental estimate to the Congress, estimated \$1,000,000 for the building of high-power radio stations, and then, in compliance with the law, requiring him to state why it had not been put in the regular Book of Estimates, giving the reasons embodied within the provision controlling the supplemental estimate, was this statement, and this statement only:

This amount was not included in the regular Book of Estimates because of the desire to keep the estimates as low as possible.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman's time be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, my question to the gentleman from New York is a simple one, and that is whether the administration has made any suggestion to Congress as to meeting the discrepancy between the anticipated revenues and the anticipated expenditures, as required by the Smith amendment?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The law requires the President to do certain things—

Mr. MARTIN. I know what the law requires. I am asking for the facts.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The Secretary of the Treasury transmitted the estimates in December, and by eliminating the supposed expenditure to meet the sinking-fund requirements the surplus was about \$15,000,000, and under those circumstances no obligation rested upon him to transmit the estimates for expenditures or receipts to the President.

Mr. MARTIN. I am bound to say that I think the gentleman from New York is lacking in his usual frankness and his usual freedom in imparting information to this committee. The question I asked was a simple one, and it has not been answered. I understand from other sources that during the Taft administration and after the passage of the Smith amendment an effort was made to comply with the provisions of the amendment. Whenever in any particular year the anticipated expenditures exceeded the anticipated revenues the various departments were required by the President to revise their estimates and to conform to the requirements of the law, so that there would be no need of any estimates in excess of the anticipated revenues.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The law did not require what the gentleman says was done, and it was drafted to prevent that being done.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, the law is very plain.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It placed the reduction of expenditures in the departments so as to place the responsibility for expenditures in excess upon the Congress. What the law contemplated was this: That after the administration had determined how much it was believed was required for the conduct of the public service, if those estimates exceeded the estimated receipts or revenues, they should be transmitted without

being cut, with the President's opinion as to how they could be cut without impairing the public service or, if in his opinion that amount of money was required, what additional revenue should be raised.

What was done in the Taft administration was this: It was found that the sums believed to be essential for the conduct of the public service were in excess of the public revenues. Instead of complying with the law they eliminated items from the estimated expenditures and transmitted to the Congress estimates that they knew were insufficient and inadequate for the conduct of the public service, in order to avoid appearing before the country as asking for money for expenditures in excess of the anticipated revenues of the Government.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, the provisions of the law, I think, are quite plain, and I shall print the Smith amendment in connection with my remarks. What I desire to say is that while under the Taft administration some executive effort was made each year to compel the different departments to keep their estimates within the anticipated revenues that were to come during the fiscal year, apparently no effort is being made on the part of the present administration to furnish any information to the Congress as to the anticipated revenues or to make any comparison between the anticipated revenues and the anticipated expenses, and as a result we have been furnished during no year of the present administration with any information on the subject. I see the Chairman of the committee is raising his gavel, and inasmuch as I have been very liberal in yielding to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota asks unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN. I have made this reference to be considered in connection with the recommendation of the gentleman from New York, the chairman of this committee, which he made in the House in his opening speech under the general debate on this bill, when he stated that in his opinion the way to produce harmony between the receipts and expenditures, and to hold unnecessary expenditures down, was to place greater power in the hands of the executive departments of the Government and remove from individual Members of this House the power of individual initiative regarding appropriations. I think these instances I have cited very clearly illustrate that that is not the way to curtail expenditures in the administration of the Government. Invariably we obtain in the recommendations of the Executive and the executive departments requests for much larger appropriations than the anticipated revenues, unless they are admonished to keep the estimates down. The chairman of this committee, in his opening statement to the Committee of the Whole at the beginning of the consideration of this bill, stated that in four years the estimates of the Treasury officials sent to the Committee on Appropriations for the purpose of the sundry civil appropriation bill were in the aggregate \$97,000,000 more than the amounts actually recommended by the committee. It is not to the executive departments, nor to the recommendation of the executive departments, that we can look with any hope of curtailments or economy of appropriations.

The Constitution has placed responsibility for appropriations and of initiating revenue measures upon the House of Representatives, and the experience and the history of all Governments has been that the further you get away from the power that spends the money in determining what the expenditures are to be, and the closer you get to the people through their short-term representatives, the nearer you get to economy in the financial administration of the Government. I am one of those who believe that the Congress of the United States, and particularly the House of Representatives, must face responsibility for appropriations and responsibility of making the two ends meet between the revenues that are to be provided and the ways and means and the expenditures that are to be made by the various appropriation committees. The firmer we lay that responsibility upon the combined membership of the House, and the sooner we cease to shift the responsibility upon any other branch of the Government, the sooner we will arrive at an economic administration of our affairs. I think that the practice of the present administration is absolutely making no effort to consider the relation between expenditures and receipts for any given year, asking for large expenditures without any suggestion of where the money is going to come from to meet them, is a practice that if followed by a private individual or a corporation would lead to inevitable bankruptcy, and we ought to insist upon the enforcement of this amendment in the estimates that come from the administrative departments.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting the Smith amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The amendment is as follows:

ESTIMATED EXPENDITURES, PRESIDENT TO CONSIDER RELATION OF, TO REVENUES.

Immediately upon the receipt of the regular annual estimates of appropriations needed for the various branches of the Government it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to estimate as nearly as may be the revenues of the Government for the ensuing fiscal year, and if the estimates for appropriations, including the estimated amount necessary to meet all continuing and permanent appropriations, shall exceed the estimated revenues, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transmit the estimates to Congress as heretofore required by law and at once transmit a detailed statement of all of said estimates to the President, to the end that he may, in giving Congress information of the state of the Union and in recommending to their consideration such measures as he may judge necessary, advise the Congress how in his judgment the estimated appropriations could with least injury to the public service be reduced so as to bring the appropriations within the estimated revenues, or, if such reduction be not in his judgment practicable without undue injury to the public service, that he may recommend to Congress such loans or new taxes as may be necessary to cover the deficiency. (Mar. 4, 1909, Stat. L., vol. 35, p. 1027, sec. 7.)

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I am familiar with the history of the so-called Smith amendment. It was designed to accomplish a beneficial purpose. In 1906 Congress enacted section 4 of the sundry civil act, which required that all estimates for annual services should be furnished to the Secretary of the Treasury for inclusion in the Book of Estimates, and prohibiting special additional estimates except to carry out laws subsequently enacted or when deemed imperatively necessary for the public service by the department in which they shall originate, in which case such special or additional estimate was to be accompanied by a full statement of its imperative necessity, and so forth. Estimates had been juggled and shifted and sent in such a haphazard manner to Congress that there was no system or logic in the manner in which the public business was transacted. After the enactment of this law it was believed to be desirable to try and fix some greater responsibility upon the executive for the submission of estimates. Estimates were being sent to Congress for the appropriation of public funds without any regard whatever to the anticipated revenues of the Government during the fiscal year for which these expenditures were to be made, and it was then that the so-called Smith amendment was adopted. I shall not repeat it, as the gentleman from South Dakota will have it printed in his remarks. The purpose of that amendment was to have the executive departments of the Government prepare the estimates of the public moneys believed to be essential for the proper conduct of the public service. It would make little difference whether the revenues were to be in excess of the proposed expenditures or to be less than the proposed expenditures. What Congress was entitled to know was what the executive departments believed was necessary from the standpoint of the executive to conduct the public service.

It provided that if the estimated expenditures were in excess of the estimated revenues that the President should transmit both to Congress and inform Congress where the expenditures could be reduced "with the least injury to the public service," and if in his opinion they could not be reduced so as to bring them within the estimated revenues, that he should recommend to Congress such measures as in his judgment were necessary to cover the deficiency. That was to obtain, first, the estimates of the department as to how much was necessary to conduct the Government, and, secondly, the opinion of the President as to any manner in which those estimates could be reduced without impairing the public service; or if he did not believe they could be reduced, what measures should be adopted to obtain the revenue. Now, the whole purpose of that law was frustrated by the policy which was adopted. Immediately after its enactment the estimates of expenditures were prepared by the departments, and when it was ascertained they were likely to be in excess of the anticipated revenues, directions were issued to make cuts of certain amounts, and the estimates were submitted within the anticipated revenues. Thereafter, in the investigations which were conducted by Congress, it developed that a number of officials called upon to explain their estimates would make statements of this tenor; that in their opinion the amount requested would not be sufficient to properly maintain the public service; that they had prepared the estimates in a larger sum; that they had been directed to reduce it; that they had protested that it

was impossible to conduct the public service within that sum, but still had to submit such an estimate. That happened, for instance, in connection with items for pay of the Army where, regardless of the amount of money reported by Congress, a deficiency which is recognized within the law can be incurred for the pay of the Army up to authorized enlistment—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I ask for a minute or two more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is true in connection with the estimates for the transportation of the Army where the War Department is authorized to incur obligations for the transportation of troops regardless of the appropriation that is made. It was true in regard to a number of other services where the law authorizes the services to be conducted regardless of whether the appropriation is sufficient—obligations that are binding upon the Government and which are allowed to be incurred. Then, there were these additional instances to which I have already referred, one where the Secretary of the Navy submitted a supplemental estimate of \$1,000,000 for a high-power radio station and gave as his explanation, within the law requiring that an additional estimate be accompanied by a full statement of its imperative necessity and reasons for its omission in the annual estimates, that this estimate was not included in the regular Navy estimates because it was desired to keep the estimates as low as possible, which was a gross and flagrant violation of the law. What was done about it? I took the item out of the naval appropriation bill on a point of order, because of its being a gross violation of the law. The appropriation recommended was, I think, \$400,000 of the million dollars, but it was put back in another body in a Republican House which tumbled over itself in ratifying such a flagrant violation of the law. Now, that has not been done by this administration. Whether there will be a deficit or a surplus, this administration has submitted the estimates believed to be required to conduct the public service. The Secretary of the Treasury at the opening of Congress, in his report to Congress, shows an apparent surplus of \$15,000,000, so the Smith amendment did not operate as to requiring the President to make recommendations such as otherwise would have been required.

Mr. GILLETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. GILLETT. The gentleman says this administration was not affected by the Smith amendment. Does the gentleman think that it is fair to make up estimates as this administration did? In the Post Office estimates, where there was estimated a reduction of \$20,000,000 in the hope that they will adopt a recommendation contrary to existing law, which anyone who has been in Congress would know there is no chance of being adopted. Does the gentleman think that is a fair way to make up estimates?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not know that I should characterize recommendations of the departments as fair or unfair. The Postmaster General's estimates for the Postal Service for the next fiscal year aggregate, I think, \$297,000,000, conditioned upon the enactment of certain legislation. His estimated revenues, if I recall them correctly, were \$327,000,000, and the Secretary of the Treasury in his annual report, in reviewing the estimates of expenditures and anticipated revenues, called attention to the fact that the estimates of the Postmaster General are contingent upon certain legislation being enacted by Congress, and if it were not enacted that the service would absorb all the anticipated revenues, so that this apparent surplus in the postal receipts was not used to avoid the operation of the Smith amendment.

Mr. GILLETT. Well, in the Book of Estimates the estimate for the Post Office appropriation bill was \$297,000,000, whereas in compliance with the existing law it ought to have been \$320,000,000, or a difference of \$23,000,000. That is the way of making an apparent surplus in a case where there is really a deficit.

Mr. FITZGERALD. He did not do that because the postal estimates in certain respects are eliminated, while if Congress had complied with the recommendation of the Postmaster General and the legislation had been enacted and there had been no falling off of postal revenues, there would have been a surplus of over \$20,000,000, while, as pointed out by the Secretary of the Treasury, if this legislation was not enacted the conduct of the department would absorb this revenue and no advantage was taken of that in compiling the fiscal statement.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. The gentleman from New York is a very

adroit debater and a very faithful apologist for this administration. The gentleman from New York says the last Republican administration did not comply with the provisions of the Smith amendment. He criticizes that administration because there was some supplemental estimates made, he says, without the proper legal explanation. As a matter of fact, all of these original and supplemental estimates were not only within the estimated revenues but within what developed to be the actual revenues. The real important and outstanding fact with regard to these matters of comparison between the then Republican administration and this Democratic administration is this: That the Taft administration, both in its estimates and in its expenditures, kept within the public revenues, and this administration, whatever may be said of its original estimates, both of expenditures and of receipts, clearly as to its actual expenditures, will far exceed the actual receipts all the way from \$30,000,000 to \$100,000,000, as our friend from New York has informed us. Now, that is the real important, outstanding fact, that the Taft administration in estimates and expenditures kept within the revenues and left a balance in the Treasury; that this administration, whatever may have been the fact as to its first estimates, will in its expenditures compel the American people to go down in their pockets for an additional sum over the ordinary revenues of anywhere from \$30,000,000 to \$100,000,000.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wyoming yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. MONDELL. I do.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That administration issued about \$30,000,000 of Panama Canal bonds. This administration has not issued any bonds whatever.

Mr. MONDELL. The Taft administration expended, as I recall it, in the neighborhood of \$150,000,000 for the building of the Panama Canal for which no bonds were issued.

Mr. GILLETT. It was more than that. It was over \$200,000,000.

Mr. MONDELL. Over \$200,000,000, the gentleman from Massachusetts says, for which no bonds were issued. This administration will issue more bonds based on the Panama Canal than it has spent on the Panama Canal. That is the difference. That administration took \$200,000,000 out of the current revenues for the canal; the present administration not only will issue bonds enough to pay all that has been expended on the canal during the administration, but probably a sum greatly in excess of that, and I am sure that my friend from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] will not disagree with me in regard to that. In fact, I think he realizes that the bond issue will come quite soon. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] said the other day it would come in July.

Mr. GILLETT. The 1st of June.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman from Massachusetts says the 1st of June. I agree with him. I had understood him to say about July. Before the 1st of June the administration will proceed to issue Panama Canal bonds probably far in excess in the amount of all the moneys that have been expended under this administration for the construction of the canal, while the last Republican administration spent something like \$200,000,000 out of current funds which were never reimbursed by the sale of bonds.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] suggests that the administration did keep within the provisions of the Smith amendment in its original estimates. Well, that is a question. It depends upon how accurate their estimates of revenue were. Time is developing the fact that those estimates of revenue were too high. But almost immediately after the presentation of the regular estimates supplemental estimates began to pour into Congress for millions; and I hope the gentleman from New York will correct me if I am in error in saying that supplemental estimates up to this time have amounted to over \$20,000,000. My recollection is that they were nearer \$22,000,000 than \$20,000,000. Now, that is in addition to what is in effect a supplemental estimate on the Post Office bill of over \$22,000,000. Although it was not made as a supplemental estimate, it was added by the committee, so that the administration, in order to seem to keep within the provisions of the Smith amendment requiring that estimates shall be kept within the anticipated revenues, failed to estimate for the needs of the Government, as they must have been understood by the administration at the time, by over \$42,000,000. And had the administration made the estimates in the amount that the members of the administration must have known were necessary, the total of estimates would have been far in excess—millions in excess—of the wildest guesses of anticipated revenue.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, on reflection I think the gentleman from Wyoming was nearer right than I was when he said that it was \$150,000,000 that was spent out of current revenues in the Taft administration in constructing the Panama Canal. As I remember, up to date \$214,000,000 has been spent out of the current revenues for building the canal and about \$150,000,000 has been spent from the proceeds of bonds, but I forgot for a moment that the \$214,000,000 was not all spent during the Taft administration. Some of it was spent during the Roosevelt administration. So I think the gentleman was about right in his original statement. It occurs to me, however, in that connection to say a word in regard to the statement of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MARTIN] about the relative economy of Congress and the executive. I am inclined to disagree with the gentleman and to think that the executive, despite the fact that that is the department of the Government that spends the money, is apt to be more economical than the department that appropriates the money, because that is the single head. The executive has responsibility, whereas we here, four hundred and thirty-odd men, have, no one of us, any great sense of responsibility. It is divided up into 430 parts, and therefore whatever anyone wants he is apt to think will be divided among all and he will get what he can and trust that the others will bear the responsibility.

Mr. MARTIN. The comparison, of course, is not between the Congress and the President, the single Executive, but between the Congress and the executive departments of the Government. My suggestion was that Congress has held down the estimates made by the executive departments, and our appropriations are always under those estimated by the departments.

Mr. GILLETT. I think the gentleman is mistaken. I think the appropriations generally run higher than the estimates. For instance, in the appropriation bills that have passed the House so far, the original estimates which were sent in by the departments were \$20,000,000 less than the appropriations that passed the House, and at the same time I recognize that supplemental estimates were sent in by the administration, which I presume would just about even up.

Mr. MARTIN. You have already reminded the committee that those original estimates for the Post Office Department were some \$23,000,000. Does not the experience of the gentleman, taking one year with another, show that the appropriations for the running of the Government fall considerably below the estimates requested by the executive departments?

Mr. GILLETT. I have not looked it up, but my offhand guess would be that it is the other way, because the gentleman must recollect there is another body to be reckoned with besides this body.

Mr. FOSTER. The appropriations reported in this bill are \$9,000,000 less than the estimates.

Mr. GILLETT. But the Appropriations Committee always report less than the estimates. There is no doubt that the Appropriations Committee are more economical than the executive, invariably; but the bill is always swollen after it leaves the Appropriations Committee. It is increased first always in the House, and then it is always increased again in the Senate. We do not know what this bill will be when it is passed.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it not usually the case that the estimates are more than the appropriations as finally made.

Mr. GILLETT. I am not sure. As I say, my recollection would be the other way.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the gentleman is in error about that.

Mr. GILLETT. Very likely. I have never looked it up.

Mr. MONDELL. Is not this the fact, that the appropriations for running the departments of the Government are ordinarily considerably lower than the estimates?

Mr. GILLETT. Does the gentleman mean the departments here in Washington?

Mr. MONDELL. The departments generally; that is, the regularly established operations of the Government. For those purposes the appropriations are always less than the estimates; but if the appropriations are higher than the estimates, it is because we have added a lot of construction items, a lot of new activities, as we have added in one place in this bill a provision for increased activities of the Coast Guard, and as we will add in certain bills large sums for the acquirement of a park here in Washington, for the erection of a building somewhere, and for purposes of that kind.

Mr. GILLETT. I think that is very apt to be true. We are looking out for our different districts.

Mr. MONDELL. But I think the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MARTIN] is still correct in his statement that with

regard to those matters on which the departments estimate the appropriations are generally lower than the estimates.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MARTIN. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be allowed five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota asks unanimous consent that the time be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLETT. Certainly.

Mr. FOSTER. On this bill which is now under consideration, and the three previous ones that have been passed for the previous three years, the appropriations are \$60,000,000 less than the estimates.

Mr. GILLETT. As the bills finally became laws?

Mr. FOSTER. As the bills finally became laws. That is, counting this one, which has not yet become a law.

Mr. GILLETT. It is not fair to consider this with the others, because we do not know what the total of this one will be.

Mr. FOSTER. I realize that.

Mr. GILLETT. How much were the others?

Mr. FOSTER. I think something like \$40,000,000 or \$50,000,000 less than the estimates.

Mr. GILLETT. It is quite possible that I may be mistaken in my judgment. I have never looked it up, but I had the impression, which I have stated, from the general course of business.

Mr. MARTIN. Does not the gentleman recall that in the opening statement of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations in general debate he called our attention to the fact that during the last four years the estimates from the department for the running expenses of the Government for this sundry civil bill were some \$97,000,000 more than was actually appropriated.

Mr. GILLETT. I questioned whether he was not mistaken in that statement; but I will agree to what the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] says, that it is largely in the additional items that are put on that we make the increases. In other words, it is on the matters that affect us personally and politically in our districts that we keep adding; and that is the reason, of course, as I intimated originally, that I think Congress is not to be trusted in the matter of economy, because we can not resist the pressure that is brought upon us individually to vote for something which our constituents at home desire.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE.

For pay, allowance, and commutation of quarters for commissioned medical officers and pharmacists, \$695,000.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I regret very much that the distinguished clerk of the Committee on Appropriations is not permitted to speak on the floor, because I feel sure that I could get from him the information that I am seeking, and at this moment I do not see the chairman of the committee.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I am right on the job.

Mr. DUPRÉ. The gentleman will doubtless confer with the clerk of the committee, and therefore will be able to give me the information. I should like to know how far short is this appropriation of \$695,000 as compared with existing law? My understanding is that for the current year there was \$679,000 appropriated and then \$50,000 additional, which would make \$729,000 as against \$695,000.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, no. Last year the appropriation was \$679,858.

Mr. DUPRÉ. In addition to that there was \$50,000, was there not?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, no. This is \$15,142 more than was appropriated for the current year.

Mr. DUPRÉ. This appropriation does not cover a recommendation of \$50,000 for additional assistant surgeons in the Public Health Service?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; it does not. It does not cover \$50,000 for additional employees.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Those additional employees were covered by the present law, were they not?

Mr. FITZGERALD. This appropriation covers the employees provided at present. The Public Health Service asked \$50,000 to increase over the existing force the force of commissioned and medical officers and pharmacists.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Why did not the committee see fit to grant this request?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Because of the extraordinary growth of this service within the past few years.

Mr. DUPRÉ. All the more reason why the appropriation should be granted, apparently, if there has been such an extraordinary growth.

Mr. FITZGERALD. In 1912 the total appropriation for the Public Health Service was \$1,589,100. In this bill the total carried for the Public Health Service is \$2,868,106, or \$1,300,000 more than the service had three years ago. That is nearly 100 per cent increase, and the committee thought that this service had been growing about as rapidly as could be justified; and, as increases were made in other respects for the service, we thought we could not very well justify the increase of \$50,000 which was asked for this purpose.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Was not a request made for 20 additional surgeons?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I think there was something like that. The request was made to appropriate under this item \$50,000 more than is carried here.

Mr. DUPRÉ. I would like to be sure on this point. Did not the bill last year provide \$50,000 for additional surgeons, and is it not refused in this bill?

Mr. FITZGERALD. In 1914 the appropriation under this item was \$547,640. There was an additional \$50,000 for some employees not then added. In the bill for the current year these two items were consolidated, which made that item \$597,000, and, in addition, \$82,000 more was appropriated. Now, in the pending bill \$15,000 is added to the amount carried in the current law, so that this appropriation is about \$100,000 in excess of the appropriation two years ago, when the \$50,000 increase was first granted.

Mr. DUPRÉ. How much is the appropriation in excess of the current year?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Fifteen thousand dollars. It carries additional employees that the \$50,000 enabled the service to obtain, and provided an additional amount required because of the increase of compensation from longevity and the pay of some officers absent on leave on certain service, and who returned to the pay roll of the Public Health Service.

Mr. DUPRÉ. I represent a city which has been greatly helped and benefited in several great crises by this governmental agency, and I think it is a poor place to economize in the Public Health Service.

Mr. FITZGERALD. This is not economizing; it is increasing the appropriations. The appropriations in which the services were carried are very materially increased.

Mr. DUPRÉ. The gentleman has denied the request of the Surgeon General.

Mr. FITZGERALD. If we granted all the requests of the Surgeon General, the service would grow at such leaps and bounds that Congress would repudiate the Committee on Appropriations. We have been more than liberal to the Public Health Service.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to bring about a repetition of the unfortunate discussion that occurred on the floor some weeks ago in regard to the Public Health Service. For my part, I think it covers some of the unworthiest pages of the Record. I do not care to go into that again, but I want to find out why the gentleman was denying a reasonable request that additional surgeons be given to this department to do its work effectively.

Mr. FITZGERALD. For the current year the total appropriations for this service are \$2,779,000, and that includes \$220,000 in the deficiency. The Surgeon General asked for \$2,999,000, an increase of \$220,000, and the bill carries \$2,868,000. The committee has done very fairly by the service, and in the last three years, to my knowledge, more has been done for that service with my aid and cooperation than any other governmental service we have had. We have enlarged the force, given money for special work, given money to enable them to do things that were beneficial and to advance the public health of the country, and we have been publicly thanked by the Surgeon General of the service for our generous cooperation.

Mr. DUPRÉ. The gentleman will never aid a better cause, but I wanted to know if there was anything in here to justify the employment of 20 additional surgeons.

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; there is not.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Did the committee think it was unnecessary, notwithstanding the statement of the Surgeon General?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes; the committee thought he was making a request that could not be complied with under existing conditions.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

For purveying depot, purchase of medical, surgical, and hospital supplies, \$45,000.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DUPRÉ] complains because the committee did not allow the entire estimates made for the Public Health Service. The gentleman is a member of the majority party. The gentleman, in the main, is in harmony with the policy of his party. The gentleman, except for the item of sugar, believes in the principles of the Underwood tariff bill. I think, except for the item of sugar, he has supported his party in the policy that is so reducing the revenues of the Government that we can not increase or enlarge these various public services under this administration.

Now, I believe that the committee has fairly well taken care of the Public Health Service. I do not believe that the public health will particularly suffer under these appropriations. I think that the present activities of the service as they have been going on in the past will be reasonably cared for under the appropriations that have been made.

But the gentleman from Louisiana must understand that we can not enlarge, increase, extend, amplify, or improve the public service under Democratic administration. It can not be done. We have not the money. Even with war revenue taxes in time of profound unruffled peace, with income taxes, with the coming bond issue, with all these extraordinary methods of raising revenue, you can not do anything more than in a niggardly way take care of the service as we find it. That is all you can even hope to do under this Democratic administration. That is what we have tried to do. We have tried to avoid the actual starving of any service, but some of them will look a little thin and emaciated at the end of the year. How much better does the gentleman think we can do under the policy of this party that produces the situation in the Treasury now presented to us? [Applause on the Republican side.]

The Clerk read as follows:

For maintenance of marine hospitals, including subsistence and all other necessary miscellaneous expenses which are not included under special heads, \$250,000: *Provided*, That there may be admitted into said hospitals for study persons with infectious or other diseases affecting the public health, and not to exceed 10 cases in any one hospital at one time.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Under this authorization to admit into the marine hospitals for study persons infected with disease, does the gentleman know how many people have been admitted for study in any fiscal year?

Mr. FITZGERALD. My recollection is that there were as many as 80 persons in one year. This is practically permanent law, but it has been carried from year to year so as to obtain a statement relative to it.

Mr. MANN. We allow persons not connected with the marine service to be admitted into the marine hospitals, I suppose, for the study of disease. I thought possibly the gentleman might have the information of the number that had been admitted.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I think the statement was made either this year or last year that they had in the neighborhood of eighty-odd; that they were taking these persons in the various stations. I can not now put my hand upon the number.

Mr. MANN. Very well. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, \$1,958,106, which shall include the amount necessary for the medical inspection of aliens, as required by section 17 of the act approved February 20, 1907.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Does the gentleman know from the hearings how much of this \$1,948,106 is necessary for the medical inspection of aliens?

Mr. FITZGERALD. They formerly had an appropriation of about \$100,000 for the inspection of aliens, and it is now done by the officers of the Public Health Service.

Mr. MANN. I understand; but I think the requirements have been considerably increased.

Mr. FITZGERALD. There is no separate appropriation. They are paid out of the appropriations for commissioned officers and the like.

Mr. MANN. It would be interesting to know how much is expended for the inspection of aliens coming into the country.

Mr. FITZGERALD. We had statements showing the number of surgeons on duty in connection with the immigration work. Several years ago when the force was increased it was provided that certain of the assistants should be specially qualified for the work of examining the mental defectives. It was claimed then that the ordinary surgeon did not have that special training and qualification that would enable him to detect the mentally defective, and for several years new employees were required to be specially qualified for the work. In one of these hearings the committee had a statement of the number of surgeons that were employed on the immigration work exclusively, but I do not have it at hand. However, my recollection is that, outside of a place like New York and other ports where immigrants come in in very large numbers, the surgeon who is doing other work also makes the necessary medical examination of the immigrants, so that in some places they are not detailed exclusively for immigration work.

Mr. MANN. Does the estimate this year show the number of acting commissioned surgeons and other employees of the service?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes. I think I have all of that information. The number of acting assistant surgeons is 230. The acting assistant surgeons are the men who were taken over at the time the work of certain States was transferred to the Federal Government. In a great many instances we took over the physicians who were employed in that work.

Mr. MANN. But there certainly can not be over 200 acting assistant surgeons, surely, who are giving all of their time to the work?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Some of them are paid very small sums. For instance, we have one who is paid \$3,000. He is a very distinguished surgeon in the South, and has charge of the quarantine station at one port. There are 7 at \$2,400, 13 at \$900, 1 at \$1,780, 54 at \$300, 1 at \$270, a number at \$240, \$200, \$180, \$120, and \$100. Some of them received a nominal compensation because their services are not required for any great period of time. The \$3,000 man is a leprosy expert. The services of some of them are not very extensive, and they run down to \$100 a year. Some of them are on a very low per diem, and are simply called upon as their services are required.

Mr. MANN. How many commissioned medical officers outside of the acting assistant surgeons are there now?

Mr. FITZGERALD. In 1914 there were 161 surgeons, senior surgeons, passed assistants, and the like; and of pharmacists there were 45. The estimates for 1916 were for 202 commissioned officers and 47 pharmacists.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Quarantine service: For maintenance and ordinary expenses, exclusive of pay of officers and employees, of quarantine stations at Eastport and Portland, Me.; Providence, R. I.; Perth Amboy, N. J.; Delaware Breakwater, Reedy Island, and the Delaware Bay and River; Alexandria, Va.; Cape Charles and supplemental station thereto; Cape Fear, Newbern, and Washington, N. C.; Georgetown, Charleston, Beaufort, and Port Royal, S. C.; Savannah; South Atlantic; Brunswick; Cumberland Sound; St. Johns River; Biscayne Bay; Key West; Boca Grande; Tampa Bay; Port Inglis; Cedar Key; Puntarasa; St. Georges Sound (East and West Pass); St. Joseph; St. Andrews and Pensacola, Fla.; Mobile; New Orleans and supplemental stations thereto; Pascagoula; Gulf; Gulfport, Galveston, Laredo, Eagle Pass, and El Paso, Tex.; San Diego, San Pedro and adjoining ports, Santa Barbara, San Francisco, Monterey, and Port Harford, Cal.; Fort Bragg, Eureka, Columbia River, Florence, Newport, Coos Bay, and Gardner, Oreg.; Port Townsend and supplemental stations thereto; quarantine systems of Alaska, the Hawaiian Islands including the leprosy hospital, and Porto Rico; and including and not exceeding \$500 for printing on account of the quarantine service at times when the exigencies of that service require immediate action, \$155,000.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to inquire, if the gentleman happens to have the information, what is the necessity of maintaining a quarantine station at Alexandria, Va.? Is that quarantine against Members of Congress going South? Of course no vessel can go up there from the sea without passing quarantine somewhere else, I assume?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, it is very necessary. It is established by law. I am not familiar with Alexandria, but from what I hear about it I have no doubt that it is necessary.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] suggests that it is a port and that boats come in there. That is true of a great many places; but I should assume that a vessel with yellow fever on board could not get up to Alexandria.

Mr. MONDELL. Why not?

Mr. FITZGERALD. They quarantine against a lot of things.

Mr. MANN. If they are permitted to go by the Capes without inspection, it would be very strange. These quarantine stations are not scattered all over the United States where boats come in or where there are ports.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Vessels come and go from Alexandria.

Mr. MANN. Certainly they come and go from Alexandria. They come and go from Chicago and South Chicago also, but we do not have quarantine stations there, and they come and go directly to and from foreign ports, too.

Mr. SLAYDEN. How long has that been a quarantine station?

Mr. MANN. That probably was created a quarantine station about a hundred years ago, and they have not had time to cut it out.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, the quarantine service was established in 1888.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Prevention of epidemics: To enable the President, in case only of threatened or actual epidemic of cholera, typhus fever, yellow fever, smallpox, bubonic plague, Chinese plague or black death, or trachoma, to aid State and local boards, or otherwise, in his discretion, in preventing and suppressing the spread of the same, and in such emergency in the execution of any quarantine laws which may be then in force, \$500,000: *Provided*, That a detailed report of the expenditures hereunder shall annually hereafter be submitted to Congress.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. This appropriation is a very valuable one—

Mr. FITZGERALD. A very big one, the gentleman means.

Mr. KAHN. It is a big one, and properly so. Heretofore when this item has been reached in this bill some captious critic has generally risen on this floor and pointed out the fact that the State of California, which had a few cases of the bubonic plague nearly seven years ago, has benefited by the expenditure within its borders of a large percentage of this money. That was very true. The Federal Government between 1908 and 1914 expended about a million and a quarter dollars in the State of California in exterminating rats and squirrels to prevent the spread of this plague. The citizens of San Francisco expended out of moneys which they themselves contributed about \$150,000. The State of California, I find, contributed something like \$85,000. The city and county of San Francisco from its treasury contributed something like \$60,000. The counties outside of San Francisco contributed something like \$60,000, and the citizens of the State generally, especially those of the city and county of San Francisco, in making their habitations ratproof and in killing off the squirrels, expended several million dollars, according to the figures given me to-day by the officials of the Public Health Service.

I merely cite these figures, and they were given me this very afternoon by the officer of that service, are approximate and show that California has done its share. Recently the plague broke out in New Orleans. The Public Health Service did a very valuable work in properly making a vigorous effort to stamp it out. The citizens of New Orleans and the State of Louisiana have come to the assistance of the Public Health Service and have contributed considerable money to stamp out this terrible disease. There is no doubt that the citizens of that State and that city were stimulated in their endeavors by the efforts that had been made by the citizens of California and of San Francisco in their efforts to save the rest of the Union from this dreaded disease.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Have the cities of Los Angeles and San Diego been troubled with this disease?

Mr. KAHN. Not within my knowledge. Of course, San Francisco and Seattle, of all the ports on the Pacific coast, are peculiarly open to possible attacks of this disease, because vessels come from the Orient to those ports, and the disease is one that thrives and flourishes in the ports of the Orient. But, of course, the number of cases reported have been few and the occasions when they have occurred exceedingly rare.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Has it appeared in any of the Puget Sound cities?

Mr. KAHN. Yes; the city of Seattle is contributing its share toward stamping it out, and the Federal Government is doing some work there. I understand that out of this appropriation of \$500,000 about \$310,000 are to be expended by the United States for the extermination and eradication of this plague in the State of Louisiana. It is money well expended. It protects the other States of the Union from a possible invasion of that dread disease, and I sincerely hope that the critics of the State of California and the city of San Francisco will realize the fact that no section of the Union is immune; that the plague is apt to appear anywhere, and that the Government is justified in appropriating the necessary sums to stamp it out.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I did not expect anybody from San Francisco would think my memory was so short that that statement could be made here on the floor in a sort

of boastful way that San Francisco and California were entitled to any particular credit for what it had done in the cooperation with the Public Health Service to eliminate bubonic plague. I had a very vivid recollection that the threat to stop all the work of the public service and quarantine the State of California about the time the World's Fair would open, finally had the effect of making the people of that State wake up to a realization that some responsibility evolved upon them to help eliminate that plague. I recall that the governor of the State of California vetoed a bill passed by the legislature that was designed to enable the State to do some little part in the work of eradicating the bubonic plague. However much I was surprised to hear the gentleman speak in a congratulatory tone about the work of California, I must confess it was with the utmost amazement I heard him, without the shadow of a smile, express the opinion that it was owing to the good example of the city of San Francisco and the State of California that induced the people of New Orleans to do anything in cooperation with the Public Health Service to eliminate the bubonic plague from that city.

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. If the people of New Orleans had followed the example of the people of San Francisco and California, they would not have expended a single dollar until the United States Government had, in effect, threatened to leave them to their fate. I yield at this point because I am going to show what New Orleans did with the horrible example of San Francisco before it.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield.

Mr. KAHN. The health officer or the officer of the Public Health Service told me this afternoon that when the matter was put up to the people of New Orleans they rather demurred at putting up any money until they were told what had been done by the people from San Francisco, and thereupon they did do a share of the work just as the people of San Francisco had done from the very beginning of the work.

Mr. FITZGERALD. No, Mr. Chairman; again I repeat that if New Orleans had followed the horrible example of San Francisco it would have done nothing. I do not know of anything in my experience in public life that so shocked me as the absolute disregard of the interest of their own people exhibited by the people of California and the city of San Francisco. They just declined to take any action or to assume any part of the burden until by a very vigorous protest upon this floor notice was served upon that city and that State that Congress would quit doing the work that should have been paid for by them unless they showed more interest. It figured out about \$10,000 a rat or squirrel in California that the people of the city asked that the Federal Government pay. New Orleans from the outset started in to cooperate, and up to the 1st of December, I will state, from the date of the discovery of the first case, they spent \$83,000 over the check of the Public Health Service officials.

That was from the 8th of July, 1914, to the 1st day of September. That is as much, as I recall, as San Francisco expended all told.

Mr. KAHN. Oh, no.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Well, pretty nearly. The Federal Government spent \$122,179.48 during the same period. The city spent in addition \$40,000 in the improvement of its garbage-collection service, upon the recommendation of the Public Health Service. The city has engaged to erect a new garbage incinerator at the cost of about \$1,000,000, also upon the recommendation of the Public Health Service. The city will spend about \$37,000 in the rat-proofing of its public buildings. They also have erected a laboratory for the use of the department of public health, to cost \$6,000. For the department of police, or public protection, they have spent about \$11,000. These things are in addition to the \$83,000 expended by the Public Health Service. Then the city has erected a special plague hospital at a total cost of \$70,000, and the maintenance of the hospital in July, August, September, October, and November cost \$13,222. Then it adopted certain ordinances requiring the rat-proofing of property, and one railroad had already expended \$121,000 in complying with these ordinances, which were enacted at the direction of the Public Health Service. The estimate, as nearly as could be made by Dr. Rucker, was that New Orleans had expended or had obligated itself to expend approximately \$5,000,000 in this work.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. FITZGERALD. In just a minute. In addition to that, it proposes to rat proof the docks there in cooperation with the State, and that will take a very, very large sum of money. If

the city of San Francisco and the State of California had in the faintest manner possible emulated the example of New Orleans, there would not have been the slightest criticism, and I think it takes considerable effrontery, even from so genial a Member as the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] to make the suggestion here, without the shadow of a smile, that the example of California and San Francisco, which was condemned so vigorously and universally here and elsewhere, could have been considered in any way a stimulus to the people of New Orleans.

Now, I am accustomed, of course, to accept with a great deal of graciousness statements made by gentlemen about the activities and valuable services of the people of their communities, but this was a little too much for me, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MOORE. I wanted to know if the gentleman could tell whether the prohibition vote has increased in California by reason of all these rats the gentleman has been telling us about?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not know. I am discussing a serious question.

Mr. MOORE. I observed that the gentleman was discussing rats, and that is a very serious question.

Mr. FITZGERALD. And I hope the spirit of levity will be kept out of the debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has referred to the statement of Dr. Rucker and has quoted him as his authority. I simply desire to call to the attention of the committee the fact that Dr. Rucker is my authority for the statement that he impressed upon the people of New Orleans the necessity for coming to the aid of the Federal Government by reason of the splendid work that had been done in San Francisco in this matter. I understand that at the present time the State of California is doing the bulk of the work and that the work of the Federal authorities out there now is cut down to something like \$3,000 a month. There is still very much work to be done in eradicating the squirrels. Bubonic plague is a menace to the life and well-being of the inhabitants of any State or community that may be stricken by it. The people of San Francisco from the very beginning, as citizens and residents of that community, gave liberal assistance to the Public Health Service and put up their money freely in helping to stamp out the plague.

Mr. BARTLETT. When did your legislature first appropriate money for this purpose?

Mr. KAHN. Of course I was in Washington at the time, but, as I understand it, the governor did veto such a bill on the ground that the counties in which the squirrels and the rats were found were putting up money out of their funds, and also that the individual citizens were contributing toward the expense.

Mr. FITZGERALD. This was a bill that was prepared by the public-health officials in the State of California to enable the State public-health officials to do work that is believed to be absolutely essential. The legislature passed the bill and the governor found some excuse, whatever it may have been, to veto it.

Mr. KAHN. I think that was his excuse.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It was to make it impossible for the State to do anything; and if it had not been for the threat that was made that we would quarantine your State and shut your exposition up, it never would have spent it.

Mr. KAHN. I do not think the gentleman wants to go so far as to say that the people of San Francisco have been derelict.

Mr. FITZGERALD. You have not anything to boast of.

Mr. KAHN. We have done as much as any community in this country has ever done.

Mr. SHERLEY. My impression was that the country tried to put it on the city, and the city tried to put it on the county, and the county tried to put it on the State, and the State tried to put it on the Nation.

Mr. FITZGERALD. They all joined in that raid.

Mr. KAHN. The city and county of San Francisco always did "come across." It has always done its share.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It made a lot of noise but really did not do anything.

Mr. KAHN. The gentleman from New York comes from a city where they always make a great deal of noise and do mighty little. The State of California always meets the Government halfway.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Most of the time it stands right at the very door of the Treasury; not only halfway, but right at the very door.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. If the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] will kindly break away from the rat discussion which he is con-

tinuing privately with the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN], I should like to ask him a serious question about the mosquito.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Anything I have said about the California situation is very important.

Mr. MOORE. I understand that. I gathered from what the gentleman said that his heart is wrapped up in the subject of rats, and I had no desire to break in upon him until that discussion was concluded. What I do want to know is whether the gentleman has considered the mosquito question with reference to the spread of yellow fever, as provided for in this paragraph? In the following paragraph an appropriation of \$200,000 is made to investigate the diseases of man. For a long time past I have been investigating this mosquito question myself, and I have been told by experts in animal culture in the House that the proper place to investigate the mosquito is in the medical department. I know the gentleman from New York is tired, but I will make this speech, whether he answers or not.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not have to stand up while the gentleman is talking.

Mr. MOORE. It would be polite if the gentleman would do it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I know; but if I had to stand up while everybody talked I would never sit down. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE. It would be in accordance with that parliamentary practice in which the gentleman is an expert. What I wanted to find out was not what the gentleman knows about rats, but what he knows about mosquitoes. Is there anything in the testimony before the committee that shows whether the medical service will take up the investigation of the mosquito under either of these two appropriations—one for the prevention of epidemics and the other for field investigations?

Mr. FITZGERALD. They have thoroughly thrashed out the mosquito theory in connection with these various things. They know that a certain species of mosquito transmits yellow fever, that a certain other species transmits malaria, and certain other species transmit something else. They have fully investigated that subject.

Mr. MURRAY. Is it the male or the female mosquito that does this?

Mr. MOORE. I can answer that question myself. It is the female. Will any of this nearly \$700,000 be spent in cooperation with States that have made appropriations for the extermination of the mosquito or its larvæ?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; none of this money is for that purpose.

Mr. MOORE. Is there no way by which we can secure the cooperation of the Federal Government with those States that do appropriate money for drainage purposes or for sanitation, with a view of destroying the larvæ of the mosquito?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I hope not. A way may be found, but I hope not.

Mr. SHERLEY. I suggest to the gentleman that perhaps the Federal Government might consider it after the city of Philadelphia had concluded to clean up that stream that it has been trying to get the Federal Government to clean up for so many years.

Mr. MOORE. That is altogether beside the question. The gentleman from Kentucky is altogether mistaken as to his facts. The city of Philadelphia has cleaned up that stream—the Frankford Creek—that the Government failed to appropriate money for, although in like cases in Kentucky and elsewhere the Government has often made such appropriations.

Mr. MURRAY. Why not pour a little coal oil on the water?

Mr. MOORE. If New York would establish a mosquito quarantine, or barrier of some kind, and prevent the New York mosquitoes flying over into Pennsylvania and New Jersey, we would not need it. But evidently we are to have no relief, so far as the Federal Government is concerned. We are to spend \$500,000 for the prevention of epidemics, including the prevention of yellow fever, which is spread by the female mosquito, of which Gen. Gorgas tells us there are about 200 varieties. We are to spend \$200,000 on field investigation of the diseases of man, of one kind and another, but the greatest pest of them all and the one that carries the most disease, the one that spreads malaria and yellow fever perhaps more than any other, the mosquito, is to be overlooked. I want to find a way, either through the Agricultural Department or through the Medical Bureau, by which we can deal with this worst of all the pests that afflict the human species.

Mr. FITZGERALD. This money is expended only in case of threatened or actual epidemic of cholera, typhus fever, yellow fever, smallpox, bubonic plague, Chinese plague, black death, or trachoma. Those are certain well-defined contagious diseases that become epidemic. In case of threatened or actual epidemic of such diseases this money will be expended in cooperation

with the States or local authorities, or in any other way to be effective. Now, that is as far as the Federal Government can legitimately be expected to go. To undertake the other work of exterminating mosquitoes regardless of their propagating diseases is unnecessary.

Mr. MOORE. The greater the annoyance the less assistance.

Mr. FITZGERALD. This appropriation is not to remove annoyances or nuisances. It is to enable the Federal Government to cooperate in cases of threatened epidemic and certain well-known disastrous or devastating contagious diseases. That is all; and it is limited to that. The gentleman has in mind a matter that is in an entirely different category, and that would be the cooperation of the Federal Government in States or localities eliminating the mosquito, which is a source of certain inconveniences and certain diseases to man, by drainage methods, and the like.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired, and the pro forma amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make an inquiry in relation to this. Am I in error that when we made the appropriation the first time, it was one to remain available until expended? Was not an appropriation at the beginning made of half a million dollars, or some such sum, as an emergency fund to remain available until expended?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The first appropriation was made by joint resolution in 1899, of \$200,000, and another of \$100,000. Then there was, in 1890, an appropriation of \$100,000; one in 1893 of \$100,000; one of 1894 of \$900,000. Then there was none until 1899, and then appropriations have been made from time to time. None was made in 1911 or 1912, but it is a continuing appropriation.

Mr. MANN. I was not here when the first appropriation was made, according to that. I remember one that was made some years ago which was an appropriation for an emergency and remained available until expended, with the idea that if there arose an emergency—some real epidemic—the executive department would have money for expenditure even though Congress was not in session, and money which could be used instantly without waiting for Congress, if it was in session, to make an appropriation. Last year this was \$200,000.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes; and two hundred and twenty thousand in a deficiency bill this year.

Mr. MANN. That was apparently available only for the year. I am not criticizing what is being done here; but what I would like to know is, how far the making of appropriations for emergencies is now being made use of in the Public Health Service in aiding the States to take care of ordinary contagious diseases which are not epidemics in any sense of the word, and which are not brought into the country from the outside, as was contemplated in the original provision, but going out and spending the money in taking care of ordinary contagious diseases?

Mr. FITZGERALD. A few years ago it was found that a permanent force had been built up under this appropriation, and the committee made provision for transferring the entire force to another service.

Mr. MANN. And now they have built up another force.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes; said to be due to this recent situation in New Orleans, where they discovered that bubonic plague had broken out.

The committee tries to keep the Public Health Service in sufficient funds to carry on the anticipated work resulting from existing conditions, and to give them such a sum for that work as will enable them in a case of emergency between sessions of Congress to have a considerable sum of money at its disposal for such purpose. There is at present sufficient funds to carry the service up to the 30th of July in the work that it is now doing, spending about \$37,000 a month in New Orleans, and an appropriation of half a million dollars from July on would give them a considerable sum in case any emergency which occurred between then and the meeting of Congress in December.

But, remembering what the gentleman from Illinois has in mind, we have tried repeatedly to keep the fund segregated to be used only in case of an emergency and to be at the disposal of the President in case of a threatened actual epidemic. Our efforts apparently have not had much effect on the service, for it has established what appears to be a permanent service under this appropriation.

Mr. MANN. I understand the committee has done everything it could. This is not the only case. Take the Forestry Service in the Agricultural Department. We made an appropriation for an emergency when there were great forest fires. We make an annual appropriation for taking care of forest fires. Then we endeavor to appropriate an emergency fund, but they go ahead and spend the emergency fund for ordinary fires without

any hesitation at all. Now, when we try to establish an emergency fund for the Public Health Service to meet an emergency, they build up a permanent force and go ahead and spend the money. Every other service has practically the same tendency to do the same thing. It is human nature. I do not know as there is any way to correct it. Now, we are engaged in stamping out disease in New Orleans and San Francisco and a few other places; they might bring it to Chicago and probably the people of Chicago would not kick. It may be that I would be defending it if I were there, but it would not make it any more proper. I have no objection—quite the contrary; I am in favor of the emergency fund to meet emergencies that arise from the introduction of contagious and infectious diseases from abroad and stamping it out before it spreads through the country. I do not know whether the fund has been improperly used. I do not say that it has; but apparently they find an emergency existing all the time, where before we commenced making these appropriations in this way they got along without it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Field investigations: For investigations of diseases of man and conditions influencing the propagation and spread thereof, including sanitation and sewage, and the pollution of navigable streams and lakes of the United States, including personal service, \$200,000.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 44, line 5, strike out "\$200,000" and insert "\$300,000."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I believe this is the only time for a long time that I have offered any amendment to increase any appropriation, owing to the present condition of the Treasury. We provided a year or so ago for the Public Health Service to carry on an investigation of diseases of man and conditions influencing the spread and propagation thereof, including sanitation, sewage, and the pollution of navigable streams and lakes of the United States. The Committee on Appropriations, I think, has been quite liberal. They made an appropriation of \$200,000 for the current law, and they carried in this bill an item of \$200,000 for the next fiscal year, but that is a service where there ought to be some growth. It can do more good probably to the people of the United States than any other expenditure of money which can be made, and in view of the fact that the other side of the House has so frequently added unnecessary appropriations, I thought I would suggest a proper increase in a very essential appropriation at this time.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will not be agreed to. The committee has treated the Public Health Service very liberally, and it has responded to what is believed to be a demand on the part of the public that this service should engage in certain work along certain lines that would be advisable and beneficial. These investigations were only authorized in 1914. The committee at that time recommended an appropriation of \$200,000, which was made. The committee also recommended an appropriation of \$47,000 for equipping a special hospital to do certain work in connection with pellagra investigations. For the current year it reported \$200,000, the amount requested by the service. This increase would be of no particular benefit to the service unless the number of commissioned officers of the service were increased. The committee has not done that. This money could not be expended unless the number of officers was increased. In view of the fact that the committee has been very liberal with this service, I hope the amendment will not prevail.

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of New York. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. How much of this money is expended for the investigation of the pollution of navigable streams and lakes?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not know that I can state in figures the amount that is expended in that particular work. Certain lines of investigation were laid out two years ago for this fieldwork. One was the investigation of the Potomac River and one an investigation, I think, of the Ohio River, and unless I am mistaken some investigation of the Great Lakes. I do not recall positively.

Mr. SMITH of New York. What I want to get at is this: After the public-health authorities have established that these lakes and rivers are polluted, what do they do about it, and what can they do about it?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The object of obtaining information is to furnish it to those divisions of government, either State or local, that may be in a position to take the necessary steps to remedy conditions. For instance, sometimes the information as to the cause of the pollution in itself would enable the locality to remedy the situation of which complaint is made.

Mr. SMITH of New York. Is it not purely a local matter, and can not the local authorities deal with it, and why should the Government expend any money in this direction?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The pollution of the Potomac River, for instance, is a matter that would cover investigations in several States. No one State would be in a position to make the investigation.

Mr. SMITH of New York. What I had in mind is this: The Government has expended quite a large sum of money to establish the fact that Lake Erie, Niagara River, and other boundary waters are being polluted. After that fact has been established, a fact that had already been known to all of the States and authorities along the boundary lakes and rivers, we are exactly in the position that we were before. The local authorities are thoroughly familiar with these situations, and I can not see why the Federal Government should expend money to establish facts that are quite well known to the States, municipal authorities, and the villages along these navigable streams and waters.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MANN) there were—ayes 19, noes 21.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. MANN and Mr. FITZGERALD to act as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 18, noes 23.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

One-half of the sum of \$300,000 heretofore appropriated for the construction of a modern fireproof hospital building to replace the building of the Columbia Hospital for Women and Lying-in Asylum shall be reimbursed to the United States Treasury on or before the close of the fiscal year 1915 out of the revenues of the District of Columbia.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the paragraph. I do this merely for the purpose of asking with reference to the form of this provision. The form says that one-half of the sum appropriated shall be reimbursed to the United States before the end of the fiscal year. Has all of this \$300,000 been expended, or will it all be expended?

Mr. FITZGERALD. It will all be expended before the 1st of July.

Mr. MANN. Is the gentleman sure that it will be all expended?

Mr. FITZGERALD. That was the information. They expect to occupy it.

Mr. MANN. I understand that; but the question is whether you shall reimburse the Government for one-half of the appropriation or one-half of the expenditure.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It will all be expended.

Mr. MANN. Some of it may not be expended until after July 1 next.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It will all be obligated, even if not actually paid out.

Mr. MANN. It will all be obligated if the entire sum is used, but it is very seldom that an appropriation is used up to the last dollar. Why would it not be better to say one-half of the sum expended out of the \$300,000 appropriated shall be reimbursed?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I want to see if there is any statement by the Superintendent of the Capitol as to whether the whole sum is to be expended.

Mr. MANN. Of course the \$300,000 is the total authorization of appropriation for the construction of the hospital. I should think it would be very unusual that the bread and molasses came out exactly even.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The Superintendent of the Capitol stated that they would be very fortunate in obtaining the building that will be obtained within the appropriation of \$300,000. He said:

The hospital consists of a five-story fireproof building, 225 feet long and 106 feet deep in extreme dimensions. The building is 86 feet high at the center of the main portion and 108 feet high to the top of the towers. It contains in all 134 beds. The hospital contains 980,000 cubic feet.

Mr. MANN. Let me ask the gentleman, Would it not be perfectly safe, as far as the Government is concerned, to say "one-half of the sum expended out of the \$300,000 heretofore appropriated shall be reimbursed to the Government"?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The suggestion has been made that at line 21, page 44, after the word "appropriated," to add "or so much thereof as shall be expended."

Mr. MANN. Well, that is the same thing.

Mr. FITZGERALD (continuing). For the construction, the purpose being only to require the District to pay one-half of the actual cost.

Mr. MANN. Then you would want to strike out "on or before the close of the fiscal year 1915," because a part of it might not be paid out until after the close of the fiscal year.

Mr. FITZGERALD. These are not continuing appropriations.

Mr. MANN. No; well, I do not know whether they are or not, but it does not make any difference. If the work has been done, an accounting may not be had of the amount paid out until after the fiscal year. That would leave the reimbursement to be made as soon as it was expended.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Well, I will offer this amendment, which I think will cover the whole thing.

Mr. MANN. I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 44, line 21, after the word "appropriated," insert the words "or so much thereof as shall be expended or obligated."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION.

International exchanges: For the system of international exchanges between the United States and foreign countries, under the direction of the Smithsonian Institution, including necessary employees and purchase of necessary books and periodicals, \$32,000.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Inadvertently, yesterday, in discussing the Arkadelphia (Ark.) post-office amendment, I stated that it differed from the Willow (Cal.) case in that at Willow, Cal., the site had been donated, and it was proposed to donate plans and specifications, while at Arkadelphia the site had not been donated, and they proposed only to furnish plans and specifications. As a matter of fact, at Arkadelphia the site has been donated to the Government, and it was exactly in the same category as the Willow (Cal.) case, which the committee had previously passed upon.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. As to the donation of the plans, specification, and site.

Mr. FITZGERALD. So that the two projects are in exactly the same situation as to plans, specifications, and site, which were to be donated in both cases. I make this statement after a conference with the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Goodwin], so that there will be no misunderstanding on the part of anybody reading the RECORD as to the situation relative to the Arkadelphia matter.

I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Hereafter the Government branches under the direction of the Smithsonian Institution may exchange typewriters, adding machines, and other labor-saving devices in part payment for like articles.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Why would it not be a good thing to put a general provision in here in reference to the exchange of typewriters, adding machines, and other labor-saving devices instead of carrying it so many times in different places in different bills?

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is the intention of the committee to take it up on the deficiency bill and put in a provision.

Mr. MANN. You have a provision in here, and I do not see why you could not add it here.

Mr. FITZGERALD. We want to look into the question of making reports and limiting prices and some other matters that ought to be taken care of at the same time.

Mr. MANN. They have been sticking this provision in in recent years for lots of the departments.

Mr. FITZGERALD. There is a law now which limits the price that may be paid for typewriters.

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It requires a report to be made and requires the report to state the price paid for the typewriter and exchange price and machines turned in. There is no limitation as to prices of adding machines and other labor-saving devices, and the committee wishes to take that up and do just what should be done, if anything, in regard to the limitation of prices and the like.

Mr. MANN. Why does not the committee put the provision in here covering the general subject?

Mr. FITZGERALD. We want to take care of these people, anyway.

Mr. MANN. In recent years in the estimates some bureau asks for this and it is put in the various appropriation bills.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That is true.

Mr. MANN. Now the Committee on Appropriations put it in for the Smithsonian. I think it is a very proper provision. But if you are going to cover the general provision in the deficiency bill, I do not quite see why you would not put the provision in here.

Mr. FITZGERALD. If the gentleman thinks it wise to have it here—

Mr. MANN. Well, I will not ask to have it here; if it is going in the deficiency bill, I have no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

For all other authorized expenditures necessary in the execution of laws to regulate commerce, including per diem in lieu of subsistence when allowed pursuant to section 13 of the sundry civil appropriation act approved August 1, 1914, \$925,000, of which sum there may be expended not exceeding \$50,000 in the employment of counsel, not exceeding \$3,000 for the purchase of necessary books, reports, and periodicals, not exceeding \$1,500 for printing other than that done at the Government Printing Office, not exceeding \$100 in the open market for the purchase of office furniture similar in class or kind to that listed in the general supply schedule, and not exceeding \$65,000 may be expended for rent of buildings in the District of Columbia.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I notice that the committee has included in a good many items in this bill this language:

Including per diem in lieu of subsistence when allowed pursuant to section 13 of the sundry civil act approved August 1, 1914.

I confess after examining section 13 of the act I can see no reason for the extra expense of clerical work in printing and putting this into the different items in the bill. Money could be used for that purpose according to section 3 of the sundry civil act, and this might authorize the department to grant a per diem in lieu of subsistence not exceeding \$4 per day.

This expenditure would be authorized by the appropriation even if it were not specifically provided. It says:

For all other authorized expenditures necessary in the execution of laws to regulate commerce—

And so forth.

They have been paying per diem for the year without any specific authority; and may I ask why the gentleman thinks it necessary to include specific authority and add three lines to the appropriation bill here and in a great many other places in the bill?

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is true that the committee has inserted this language in a number of places in the bill. In the first place, it has inserted it where the service has estimated as required by law and stated its pay at so much per diem. In other instances it has inserted it where investigation has found that it was so doing and thought it desirable. One of the matters for which there has been considerable suggestion as to the necessity for some close scrutiny was in the payment of per diem. It was thought that by inserting the provisions in this way it would help to keep a little better track of the matter.

Mr. MANN. May I ask the gentleman further, then, this question: My recollection is they used to pay \$5 per diem under the Interstate Commerce Commission. Has there been any kick registered on account of the reduction to \$4?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Last year there was a very universal protest against the limitation of \$5 a day for traveling expenses. It was said that it was impossible for important officials of the Government to travel in the style and dignity becoming the occupants of important offices for \$5 a day. Probably in some instances that is correct. But that provision originated in a peculiar way. An official of the Government said, in stating some matters connected with the service to which he was attached, that they had some employees whose subsistence, in his opinion, if they had been paying their own expenses, would have cost \$3 a day, perhaps, found it very convenient to put up at the Savoy Hotel, in New York, at the expense of the Government, and that they had no control over the matter. Then some further investigation was made, and the committee incorporated a provision, which was enacted into law without the slightest question, limiting the per diem in lieu of subsistence to not exceeding \$4 a day, and, where the actual expenses were accounted for, not exceeding \$5 a day. After that had been the law for several weeks some one seemed to awaken to the fact that on the 1st of last July it would be impossible to obtain reimbursements from the Government for subsistence where actual expenses were certified in excess of \$5 a day and where the per diem was fixed in lieu of subsistence in excess of \$4 a day. In most instances the various governmental officials have become reconciled to the situation, and while there are sporadic complaints that the allowance is not sufficient, they are not made with very great force, and a very large sum is likely to be saved as the result.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Valuation of property of carriers: To enable the Interstate Commerce Commission to carry out the objects of the act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to regulate commerce,' approved February 4, 1887, and all acts amendatory thereof by providing for a valua-

tion of the several classes of property of carriers subject thereto and securing information concerning their stocks, bonds, and other securities, approved March 1, 1913, including per diem in lieu of subsistence when allowed pursuant to section 13 of the sundry civil appropriation act approved August 1, 1914, and including not exceeding \$15,000 for rent of buildings in the District of Columbia, \$3,000,000."

Mr. LEVY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make an inquiry. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT], the ranking minority member of the committee, rose. Was he not entitled to recognition?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that is true. If the gentleman from Massachusetts has an amendment to offer, he will be recognized.

Mr. GILLETT. I move to strike out the paragraph, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BARTLETT. What does the gentleman from New York want to do?

Mr. LEVY. To reduce it to \$1,000,000 from \$3,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LEVY].

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out line 21, on page 49, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "\$1,000,000, and said valuation shall be completed within four years."

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. MANN. I would like to state, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. LEVY. I would like to strike out the last word.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman has an amendment pending.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts has made the motion to strike the paragraph out?

Mr. GILLETT. That is my motion.

The CHAIRMAN. How much time will be required for debate?

Mr. MANN. There will be quite a little time necessary to debate that, undoubtedly, and there should be a fairly full House to vote upon it. That is, I think many Members will want to be here to vote for it or against it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Of course, Mr. Chairman, this is a matter of great importance, and undoubtedly will be debated for a reasonable length of time. There should be more Members present—

Mr. COOPER. Let it go over until to-morrow.

Mr. FITZGERALD (continuing). When the matter is taken up than there are present now. The question with those of us who are here is to determine whether we ought to try to go out and bring Members here to-night or whether we should start on it to-morrow morning.

Mr. COOPER. I shall make a point of no quorum if there is an attempt to discuss this and pass it to-night. It is an important thing.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I am opposed to the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] myself.

Mr. MANN. I would like to call the attention of my friend from New York to the fact that a little while ago I offered an amendment mainly for the purpose of demonstrating what the situation was on the floor, and there were at that time, I believe, in favor of the amendment 18 or 19 and 22 or 23 against it. Since that time, I notice, most of the Democrats have left the House, and I am sure the gentleman does not want to continue the consideration of this bill with the minority having a majority on the floor. I do not think it would be fair to us. We might be tempted to do something that otherwise we would not want to do.

Mr. FITZGERALD. A large number of the Members have gone to dinner.

Mr. MANN. I understand; just a few who have been here to-day have gone to dinner—not many.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I have been here on the floor myself eight hours to-day.

Mr. MANN. I think we are making pretty good progress on this bill; and to-morrow being Calendar Wednesday, we can set that aside and proceed with the bill.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Undoubtedly there ought to be a large number of Members present when we consider this question as to whether anything is to be appropriated to continue the work of the physical valuation of railroads next year. The committee recommend \$3,000,000, which is the amount of the estimate. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] moves to strike that from the bill, and I would not feel justified in having the matter even discussed unless there was quite a large attendance of Members here.

Mr. GILLETT. Why not move that the committee rise?

Mr. BARTLETT. May I suggest to the gentleman that even if he should have a call of the House and get the Members here, they would not want to stay?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, may I say a word? I think the Members all recognize that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] has done his whole duty in the matter of getting this bill before the House and in attempting to put it through. We have worked here since 11 o'clock this morning, and it is now 10 minutes to 7 at night. I think the House will unanimously approve of the rising of the committee at this time if the gentleman will make the motion.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Can we get an agreement now as to the length of the debate on this item?

Mr. MANN. That would hardly be fair, when there are hardly 25 men on the floor.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I thought we could save time if we could secure an agreement.

Mr. MANN. You can probably get an agreement in the morning; but somebody who is inadvertently absent, attending the sessions of another body, might want to be heard upon this.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Then, Mr. Chairman, with the understanding that we will start on this item in the morning as soon as we meet to-morrow—we meet at 11 o'clock, I understand?

Mr. MANN. We meet at 11 o'clock under the order.

Mr. FITZGERALD. With the understanding that this item will be the first thing considered in the morning, so that every Member who reads the Record will have notice of the fact that the first thing to-morrow morning will be the disposition of this item for the physical valuation of the railroads, I will move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FOSTER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 21318) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. WALKER, indefinitely, on account of illness in his family.

To Mr. OGLESBY, indefinitely, on account of illness in his family.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 51 minutes p. m.) the House, under the order heretofore made, adjourned until Wednesday, February 10, 1915, at 11 o'clock a. m.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. GUDGER, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6134) to amend the act authorizing the construction of a public building at Bliddeford, Me., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1377), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 1702) increasing the limit of cost fixed by act of Congress approved June 25, 1910, for enlargement, extension, etc., of Federal building at Bath, Me., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1380), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SUMNERS, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 2471) for purchasing a site and erecting a public building at Superior, Nebr., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1378), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BURNETT, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 21184) to increase the limit of cost of the United States post-office building and site at Cohoes, N. Y., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1379), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13421) for the relief of William Hensley, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1383), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MOTT, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 16777) for the relief of Amato Castellano, Libero Baranello, and Michele Baranello, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1382), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 15934) for the relief of Mrs. Joseph Cameron, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1384), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 20439) for the relief of the heirs of the late Frank Henry Rogers, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1385), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. EVANS, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 7043) for the relief of Nabor and Victoria Leon, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1386), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 16594) for the relief of Eva G. Bond and Daisy E. Jackson, sole heirs of the late Warren F. Jackson, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1387), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 20822) for the relief of Homer Rock, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1389), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. POU, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 19090) to reimburse the officers and enlisted men of the Revenue-Cutter Service and Public Health Service for losses sustained in the wreck of the revenue cutter *Tahoma*, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1388), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MARTIN: A bill (H. R. 21380) to prohibit the unlawful use of the American flag on foreign vessels; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 21381) to amend section 6, as amended, of the act to regulate commerce, approved February 4, 1887; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 21382) to provide a harbor boat for the Coast Guard Service to replace the *Hartley* at San Francisco, Cal.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 21383) to change the name of the old post-office building at Minneapolis, Minn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 21384) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and settle certain accounts under the reclamation acts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. STEVENS of New Hampshire: A bill (H. R. 21385) to regulate certain employment agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21386) to establish in the Department of Labor a bureau to be known as the National Bureau of Labor Exchanges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. HENRY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 418) creating a commission to acquire and control the property known as Monticello, and embracing the former home of Thomas Jefferson, and the family graveyard in which his remains are interred, together with such land and ground appurtenant thereto as the committee shall find necessary in order to carry out the various public objects and purposes of this resolution, all of said prop-

erty being located in Albemarle County, Va.; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. HAWLEY: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Oregon, urging Congress to appropriate \$300,000 to be used by the Department of Agriculture in the extermination of predatory wild animals; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, praying for the enactment of a law granting pensions to the veterans of the Modoc Indian War in the State of Oregon in 1872-73; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Oregon, requesting Congress to enact a law providing a rural credits system under which farmers may obtain long-term loans on the same terms as other industries; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SMITH of Minnesota: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, relating to the placing of an embargo on the exportation of agricultural products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 21387) granting a pension to Fannie Record; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FOWLER: A bill (H. R. 21388) granting a pension to Frederick M. Scheetz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GREEN of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 21389) granting a pension to Elmanda Scott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21390) granting an increase of pension to Edgar Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEY of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 21391) granting an increase of pension to Robert L. Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND: A bill (H. R. 21392) for the relief of James F. Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MITCHELL: A bill (H. R. 21393) granting a pension to Pierce O'Connell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21394) granting an increase of pension to Theodore Basterdes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21395) to remove the charge of desertion against James Madden; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 21396) granting a pension to Emelia McNicol; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN: Protest of sundry residents of Cincinnati and Hamilton County, Ohio, against any legislation abridging freedom of the press; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of E. E. Jones and other citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, and Hamilton County, Ohio, against any abridgment of the freedom of the press; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BAILEY: Petition of John H. Glancy, of Spangler, Pa., protesting against publication called the Menace through the mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of District No. 187, German Beneficial Union, of Johnstown, and Bruno E. Ritter, of Altoona, Pa., favoring passage of bills to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of Gustav Horn, Ludwig Wertz, John Weiland, Karl Schubert, Otto Bank, W. E. Hanley, Roy S. Stutzman, M. C. Rightman, Julius Schmidt, John L. Burns, William Bauers, L. O. Pegg, E. H. Brown, N. F. Jackson, F. J. Schultz, Otto Frank, C. R. Smith, F. L. Sauer, John Smith, Adam Green, Gilbert Link, J. L. Kimmel, and Philip Klenk, all of Johnstown, Pa., favoring legislation prohibiting exportation of arms and ammunition to belligerent nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BEAKES: Petitions of Gust Gruber and 16 citizens of Monroe, and Rev. M. C. Philipp and 40 citizens of Bridgewater, all of the State of Michigan, protesting against the shipment of munitions of war to foreign countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of H. Hobart Foy and 46 citizens, of Trenton; E. A. Riede and 17 citizens, of Jackson; Mrs. Amanda A. Aulls and 22 citizens, of Manchester; L. A. Larrabee and 16 citizens, of Jackson; William C. Tarbell and 27 citizens, of Jackson, all of the State of Michigan, protesting against giving the Post-

master General censorship over publications; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BORCHERS: Petition of citizens of Champaign and Urbana, Ill., against any abridgment of the freedom of the press; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: Petition of M. P. and H. C. Cooper, protesting against the Fitzgerald amendment to the Post Office appropriation bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of National Association of Vicksburg Veterans, favoring appropriation for national celebration and peace jubilee at Vicksburg, Miss.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petitions of Matthew A. Sandrock and Edward A. Loehr, protesting against publication called the Menace through the mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of American Association for Labor Legislation, favoring the passage of the Kern-McGillicuddy workmen's compensation bill (H. R. 15222); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Elmer E. Hubbard, of Cardenas, Cuba, favoring a federation of nations first on the Western Hemisphere; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of Electrical Contractors' Association of New York, favoring 1-cent letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: Petition of sundry citizens of Eureka, S. Dak., in favor of House joint resolution 377; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CALDER: Petition of Associated Physicians of Long Island, favoring passage of the Palmer-Owen child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. DALE: Petitions of Cigar Makers' Local Union No. 132, of Brooklyn, and New York Stereotypers' Union, No. 1, urging passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Associated Physicians of Long Island, favoring passage of the Palmer-Owen child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of John C. Leeneth, Sea Cliff, Long Island, N. Y., favoring passage of bills to prohibit export of war materials; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS: Resolutions adopted by the Minnesota State Dairyman's Association, at Owatonna, Minn., to enact a law that will compel manufacturers of oleomargarine which contains cow butter to sell their product as adulterated butter subject to an internal-revenue tax of 10 cents per pound, and the usual licenses for adulterated butter, etc.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DRUKKER: Petition of citizens of Paterson, N. J., favoring passage of bills to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FARR: Petition of Peter Bollard, James F. A. Muldoon, C. A. McCarty, Edward J. Brogan, James H. Lally, J. J. M. F., and P. J. Cannon, and Mark Kennedy, of Olyphant, Pa., against circulation of certain anti-Catholic publications; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee: Petition of Tennessee Association of Credit Men, favoring passage of the Palmer-Owen child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Petitions of sundry citizens and societies of the State of Pennsylvania, favoring passage of bills to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HINDS: Petition of John H. Harrington and 10 other citizens, of Portland, Me., protesting against export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Communications of Adolph Grenlich, Louis Haussler, W. B. Retz, and William Kieseewetter, all of New Britain, Conn., in re House joint resolutions 377 and 378, S. 6688, and H. R. 19548; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOORE: Letters from Siebebburger Gesellschafts Verein, of West Homestead, Pa.; Concordia Quartette Club, Deutscher Romisch Katholischer Staats-Verband, and sundry citizens, of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring legislation to prohibit the exportation and sale of arms, ammunition, and munitions of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MORIN (by request): Petition of Elmer E. Hubbard, of Cardenas, Cuba, and citizens of Pittsburgh and Philadelphia, Pa., favoring House joint resolution 377, forbidding export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request), petition of Miss E. S. Stilwell, of Tioga County, Pa., favoring woman-suffrage amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEELEY of Kansas: Petition of citizens of Hooper County, Kans., against any abridgment of the freedom of the press; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of Hooper County, Kans., against export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. J. I. NOLAN: Enrolled copy of senate joint resolution 4 of the Legislature of the State of California, favoring the passage of the Keating bill, providing pensions for the veterans of the Indian wars; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OGLESBY: Petition of Association of the Civil War Officers, of the twenty-fourth congressional district of New York, favoring placing of volunteer officers of the Civil War on list of retired officers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Petition of Charles W. Grower, Providence, R. I., favoring passage of the Hamill bill, H. R. 5139; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petition of Dudley Hardware Co., Providence, R. I., protesting against passage of bill to prohibit Government from selling stamped and return envelopes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. RAKER: Petition by L. D. Howard, of Lassen, Lassen County, Cal., and 81 others, against the Fitzgerald amendment to the Post Office appropriation bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Mrs. L. H. Brown, of California, against Fitzgerald amendment to Post Office appropriation bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Mrs. F. O'Keefe and Mr. Henry Steltz, of Placerville, Cal., and other American citizens, favoring embargo on arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Camp Fire Club of America, against H. R. 16673, relative to leasing of public lands; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of citizens of Hollywood, Cal., favoring House bill 12292, the Owen-Palmer child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. SABATH: Petition of Chicago Federation of Labor, asking an investigation into the administration of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma: Memorial of St. Joseph's Society, protesting against passage of the Smith-Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. VOLLMER: Petition of Plattduetsche Verein, of Grand Island, Nebr., favoring an embargo on war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Louis N. Miller, of Muscatine, Iowa, for a system of Federal, State, and municipal free employment agencies; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. WALLIN: Petition of sundry citizens of Amsterdam, N. Y., favoring passage of bills to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, February 10, 1915.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Open Thou our hearts, Father in heaven, to the spiritual forces which wait upon us and inspire us with a full sense of the confidence Thou hast reposed in us as free moral agents, that we may choose right and follow the lead of our conscience in the affairs of men; that with clear conceptions and noble purposes we may do Thy will, and thus be worthy of the intellectual, moral, and spiritual gifts Thou hast bestowed upon us. In the spirit of the Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 21318, the sundry civil appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. CRISP in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration